

Mr. HARRISON. Has that been the theory?

Mr. WADSWORTH. I hope not. I think not.

Mr. HARRISON. I think not, too.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I want to make promotion in the Engineers and in the Artillery and in every other branch of the service run along in a uniform manner, with no discriminations between them.

Mr. HARRISON. I think that is perfectly all right if you will make it apply from the passage of this bill, so that it will not go back and affect these people in the past.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brandagee	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Smoot
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Overman	Sutherland
Curtis	Kenyon	Pittman	Townsend
Dial	Keyes	Pomerene	Trammell
Frelinghuysen	Kirby	Ransdell	Wadsworth
Glass	Lenroot	Sheppard	Warren
Harris	Lodge	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Harrison	McNary	Smith, Md.	
Jones, N. Mex.	New	Smith, S. C.	

The VICE PRESIDENT. Thirty-four Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Reading Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. DILLINGHAM, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. WATSON answered to their names when called.

Mr. KELLOGG, Mr. KING, Mr. McKELLAR, and Mr. HALE entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Forty-two Senators have answered to the roll call. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, I doubt our ability to get a quorum at this hour, and I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, April 20, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, April 19, 1920.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We would abide with Thee, our Heavenly Father, in the sacred attitude of prayer before entering upon the duties of the hour, that we may receive new inspiration and strength to sustain us.

I am come, said the Master, that ye might have life and that ye might have it more abundantly.

To live, to think, to will, to do things worth while, is the larger life; and so we pray for that life, that we may be with Thee, live with Thee, for Thee. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, April 17, 1920, and of Sunday, April 18, 1920, was read and approved.

COTTON.

Mr. LAZARO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter from Gov. Elect John M. Parker, of Louisiana, on the Comer amendment to the Agriculture bill. Gov. Parker is an experienced planter and merchant, and I regard his opinion as of value.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

NEW ORLEANS, April 13, 1920.

Hon. L. LAZARO,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. LAZARO: From what I understand of the Comer amendment, it provides that at least 50 per cent of any cotton tendered for delivery on contract in the New York or New Orleans markets shall be middling or above, the remainder to be of any other of the standard grades, at option of deliverer. This would tend to restrict the quality and character of cotton that is tenderable on contract, and would naturally handicap the deliverer and benefit the receiver. The result would be a contract more favorable to the spinner and possibly less favorable to the producer. It would probably enhance the value of the contract as compared with the spot basis.

Any further restriction as to the kind of cotton that may be delivered on contract will naturally make that much less ready outlet for the producer.

Owing to the wide margin between the raw material and the finished product, and also labor conditions, spinners have found it to their advantage during the past few years to use only the better grades of cotton and have neglected the lower grades. The higher grades no doubt permit them to obtain a greater production in a given time and is more profitable to them. The discount on the lower grades—for instance, 3 cents below middling for strict low middling and about 8 cents below middling for low middling—seems rather excessive. In the crop of 1919-20 there is a great quantity of low-grade cotton, which spinners show little inclination to use, notwithstanding the big discounts at which such qualities are offering, and the greatest assistance that could possibly come to the cotton producer would be some means of stimulating a demand for the low grades. The contract market at the present time represents the value only of good grade white cotton, and so far as the contract market is concerned the lower grades of good sound cotton, say good ordinary and strict good ordinary, fair color, as well as low and strict low middling, spotted, off-colored, and light tinged, all of good spinnable value, might just as well not exist.

Thanking you for your kindly letter and with kind regards, I am,
Very truly, yours,
JNO. M. PARKER.

APPOINTMENT OF A SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that what I have to say is exactly a correction of the RECORD, but if I may be indulged for a moment I desire to call attention to the fact that on Friday last a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules amending the rules of the House was adopted which I fear, by implication, might go further than was intended. Section 7 of Rule I reads as follows:

He shall have the right to name any Member to perform the duties of the Chair, but such substitution shall not extend beyond an adjournment: *Provided, however,* That in case of his illness he may make such appointment for a period not exceeding 10 days, with the approval of the House at the time the same is made; and in his absence and omission to make such appointment the House shall proceed to elect a Speaker pro tempore to act during his absence.

There was reported from the Committee on Rules a proposition which amended the first part of the rule, and in the RECORD of Friday, April 16, 1920, it reads:

Resolved, That section 7 of Rule I be amended so as to read:

"He shall have the right to name any Member to perform the duties of the Chair, but such substitution shall not extend beyond three legislative days."

It ends there and does not contain the proviso. By implication that might repeal the proviso in the rule. That, of course, was not desired or intended. I therefore ask unanimous consent that section 7 of Rule I may be so amended as that it will read:

He shall have the right to name any Member to perform the duties of the Chair, but such substitution shall not extend beyond three legislative days: *Provided, however,* That in case of his illness he may make such appointment for a period not exceeding 10 days, with the approval of the House at the time the same is made; and in his absence and omission to make such appointment the House shall proceed to elect a Speaker pro tempore to act during his absence.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to amend the rule in the manner suggested. Is there objection?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection and, indeed, that was the intention of the Committee on Rules. It was not intended that any modification should be made except that the first clause should be amended substituting three days for one. I am very glad to have the gentleman from Tennessee call attention to it.

Mr. GARRETT. I trust the gentleman from Kansas will pardon me for injecting myself into the matter at this time. I looked for the gentleman from Kansas, but did not see him on the floor, and thought that this should be corrected at once.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I just want to mention the fact that it takes Democratic assistance to carry out Republican intention.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is very clear that it was intended that this first clause only should be amended, and this is merely an interpretation of that intention.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

There was no objection.

OKLAHOMA.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, April 22 is the anniversary of the beginning of the construction of the great State of Oklahoma. I ask unanimous consent to address the House on that day, immediately after the reading of the Journal, for 20 minutes, on the subject of Oklahoma, its agricultural resources and prospects.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent that on April 22, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, he be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of Oklahoma. Is there objection?

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is that the day when the governor was originally inaugurated for the Territory?

Mr. HOWARD. No; that is the anniversary of April 22, 1889, the opening of the first part of Oklahoma's white settlement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

BILLS RESPECTING A BONUS FOR EX-SERVICE MEN.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LITTLE. Do I understand the rule correctly, that all legislation proposing bonuses to soldiers shall go to the Committee on Ways and Means?

The SPEAKER. That is the rule.

Mr. LITTLE. I introduced some legislation of that kind some time ago, which was inadvertently sent to the Committee on Rules. I am offering some more legislation now, and I hope that rule will be followed in its reference. I wanted to be sure that I was not mistaken.

CALENDAR FOR UNANIMOUS CONSENT.

The SPEAKER. The Calendar for Unanimous Consent is in order to-day, and the Clerk will call the first bill.

AQUEDUCT BRIDGE, POTOMAC RIVER.

The first business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10328) to amend an act approved May 18, 1916, entitled "An act to provide for the removal of what is known as the Aqueduct Bridge, across the Potomac River, and for the building of a bridge in the place thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

MILITARY PARK, PLAINS OF CHALMETTE.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 5918) in reference to a national military park on the Plains of Chalmette, below the city of New Orleans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, when this bill came up several weeks ago it was objected to, and in accordance with the rules controlling or governing the Unanimous Consent Calendar it was stricken therefrom, but was restored in hopes of a happier fate on a better day. I thought, in view of the sentiment that is inseparably associated with the Plains of Chalmette and the magnificent victory achieved by American arms down there on January 8, 1815, that I would again place it before the House, in the hope that I might be as successful as the old woman in the beautiful story of appealing to Philip. I dare say that you know it, but I will tell it again, for sometimes a story carries more conviction than all of the logic in the world, and a good story like this immortal classic may be told any number of times.

I know you all remember it. It is the story of the old woman who said, when Philip turned her down curtly, "I will appeal, sir, from that decision," and he said in a very ironical tone, "Appeal, madam; to whom?" Her reply was, "I will appeal from Philip drunk to Philip sober." I do not mean that any of the gentlemen who objected to this bill were intoxicated with passion or otherwise, but I thought I would appeal to them in a more generous mood to-day and get them to consider the splendid sentimentalities and all that lies behind this really magnificent work of the Colonial Dames and other great historical societies down there in Louisiana who are endeavoring to perpetuate the glories of a conflict which I thought would never fade away from America's mind. I say with all the feeling I am capable of, Mr. Speaker, that when I introduced this bill and saw it come to the floor with a favorable report, I thought that every Member of this House would gladly approve of it, for you know that that was the one great conflict that redeemed the War of 1812 from unparalleled calamities and catastrophes, which terminated in a national misere—the burning of this Capitol. That battle down by the levees of the Mississippi gave joy to every child in the United States of America after gloom had hung over this country. It brought again renewed hope into the minds of our men and women. It is inseparably associated with all that is great in the martial chapters of this country and inseparably connected with the fame of the men who left Kentucky, Tennessee, and what is known now as Mississippi, and went down 1,200 miles and arrived in New Orleans, ragged and in their bare feet, and fought the most memorable contest in that section of the country, and, according to the best historians, maintained the Louisi-

ana Purchase forever, and freed it from legal and diplomatic dispute, kept all of that part of America west of the Mississippi for future admission into this Union, and made possible, of course, that which lies beyond the west of it. [Applause.] My friends, that battle brings you back to the early pioneer days, before the "Days of old"; "Days of gold"; "Days of forty-nine." It carries you back to the days of the raft, when there were only one or two steamboats on the Potomac and Hudson and none on the Mississippi. When there were no railroads and no highways, when men came down largely by their instincts than by compass, and fought out that great and splendid battle which shall be written across the hearts and minds of all Americans, under circumstances and conditions that ought to thrill the heart of America until the last chapter is written in her history.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. DYER. I do not think there is any question as to the historical aspect nor what a splendid thing it would be to establish such a park, but will the gentleman tell us what amount of money will probably be involved in the enactment into law of this bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. There will be no money involved in the enactment of this bill.

Mr. DYER. Section 4 says—

Mr. O'CONNOR. If the gentleman will pardon me, I intend to propose an amendment striking out all after the period in line 10, which would leave it a direction, pure and simple, to the Army engineers who are already in New Orleans, engineers on the Mississippi River Commission to make a survey of the field on which was fought the Battle of New Orleans, and report back to the Congress. The House has ordered, I understand, the survey of rivers, one of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] said he could jump across. I submit, fellow Members, that sentiment should not be lost sight of altogether, even in this prosaic age. [Applause.] I dare say, with all the feeling I can summon to my aid that Jackson and Chalmette, the Leonidas and Thermopylas of our country, should be in mind of the Members in the consideration of this bill.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will.

Mr. BEE. Let me ask the gentleman, and in response to the suggestion of the gentleman from Missouri, is it not true that the Engineer Corps of the United States Army is so thoroughly equipped and organized with its present organization that they can make this examination and report back in the near future the necessary facts without really any expense to the Government?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The expense would be absolutely negligible. I say, gentlemen, that it would not do anything other than to give to the Congress the necessary information upon which it may at some time in the future act. As a matter of fact, the bill carries with it or the apparent disposition of the House is a Kathleen Mavourneen suggestion, "It may be for years, and it may be forever." No one can tell when Congress will act upon the information conveyed. It must have the information sought before any other legislation can be considered. There is no way of telling or declaring when such a bill will come before the House.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do.

Mr. SNELL. Of course, if these engineers should make a report and it was favorable, the gentleman would expect to come back and ask Congress to act upon that favorable report?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would say to the gentleman from New York, who has been so courteous in reference to this whole matter, to me, that I sincerely trust that I may have the privilege of coming back here to do noble things for the people whom I now represent; but not knowing whether I will come back or not, I must answer I do not know what I will do. If I thought the exigencies required it, that there was a great demand for economy, even if there were a favorable report, I would bow in submission to the demands of the time. I would not press any further legislation. That is my answer.

Mr. SNELL. Would the gentleman think it was a good time now to enter upon such a proposition of establishing parks throughout the country that eventually will cost at least \$500,000 apiece?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not believe we should embark upon that program at the present time; but this bill does not contemplate any such expenditure. It merely calls for a survey, the expense of which would be insignificant. It merely lays a foundation on which Congress may or may not build or construct a park.

Mr. SNELL. That has been my objection in considering this bill at this time. I appreciate the statement that the gentleman has made, and I agree with him up to a certain extent, but it does not seem to me that under the present condition of the Treasury it is right for this Government at this time to go on record as recognizing the possibility of establishing national parks at such a great expense as this will eventually cost.

If we take the initial step, then the next man, whether it is yourself or some one else in that district, would say, "Congress has already recognized this; they have made the report and now you should do the rest and appropriate the money." That is my feeling in the matter, and that is the reason why I have taken the stand that I have, and I say that I feel the same about any expense of any kind in any estimate in any part of the country, and I think that we should not enter upon it at this time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thoroughly understand and appreciate the position assumed by the gentleman from New York. I have no question about his sincerity, and I know that his opposition would be manifested whether this battle field were located in the North, East, or West. I will answer him by quoting a sentence from "Lead Kindly Light":

I do not ask to see the distant scene.
One step enough for me.

It probably is sentimental to the extent of being tearful, but in my opinion it covers the question propounded by the gentleman very succinctly and well. I do not know what the future will produce. As a matter of fact, I would not want to look into it. I honestly believe, though, and I say it now, that I hope in the years to come, when this country does find itself in a position to do so financially, that all of these great and splendid battle fields, that ought to be entwined with the most beautiful memories in American history, will be made a trust by the people of this country and guarded in such a way as to suggest to all generations that we are not unmindful of the havoc and the suffering and the tears and the trials of the people who made this country great and splendid. I want these magnificent victories of the days when our Republic was young to be kept alive. I want them and their glories maintained lest we forget the days when our country was a vast wilderness from the Mississippi to the Pacific Ocean, the days when even the eastern bank of the Father of Waters was barely known, when Kentucky was the dark and bloody ground, and Tennessee and Mississippi, whose sons marched with Old Hickory over what is to-day a great highway to repel an invader, were yet in the making; the day of romance and adventure when the brave hearts in the bosoms of women and the breasts of men beat down the difficulties of the wilderness and made a land that to-day is a justification of the apothegm: The desert shall rejoice and blossom as the rose.

I hope that somebody will come after me when this country is in a position to afford it financially—if we are going to rest even for a time upon dollars and throttle sentiment—I hope some one will come after me and press such a measure, not only for Chalmette, but for other great and splendid places in this country, where American arms vindicated all that the people struggled and fought for during the memorable epochs that led to the greatness and glory of this country. [Applause.]

The Battle Abbey is a shrine to the people of England. The field of Waterloo speaks to all of Europe that which the written word can never convey. Chalmette should be as dear to Americans.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DYER. I see from this report that this bill was submitted to the Secretary of War, and he submitted it to the United States Engineers' office for report, and that a report has been made.

I do not see what could be accomplished now by limiting the bill simply to making another report when a report has been made and submitted and recommended.

Mr. O'CONNOR. You will see that that was purely tentative, and was not carried out in the detail that they promised in the report.

Mr. DYER. I doubt if any other report is necessary unless we want to pass the whole bill as written. I move to strike out—

Mr. O'CONNOR. I move to strike out—

Mr. DYER. I think we had better find out if there is going to be any objection, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I am appealing to you not to make an objection.

Mr. DYER. I ask for the regular order in order to find out if there is objection.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, purely in the interest of economy I feel obliged to object to the further consideration of this bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, may I have unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. [Applause.]

CLAIMS OF KLAMATH TRIBE OF INDIANS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 5163) authorizing the Klamath Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. The bill should be reported, or it should be explained by some one.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that was up about a month ago on unanimous-consent day; its main purpose is to authorize the Klamath, Moadac, and Yahooskin Tribes of Indians to take into the Court of Claims a controverted matter concerning their reservation boundaries. It authorizes the Court of Claims to investigate the merits of their claim that they have lost some 400,000 acres of land from the land which they reserved to themselves when they ceded a much larger area to the United States. And if the Court of Claims finds that their claim is a just one, they will not be paid any more than the value of the land at the time of the loss, and that would be something under a dollar an acre.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5163) authorizing the Klamath Tribe of Indians to submit Claims to the Court of Claims.

Be it enacted, etc., That all claims of whatsoever nature which the Klamath Tribe of Indians may have against the United States, which have not heretofore been determined by the Court of Claims, may be submitted to the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States by either party, for determination of the amount, if any, due said tribe from the United States under any treaties, agreements, or laws of Congress, or for the misappropriation of any of the funds of said tribe, or for the failure of the United States to pay said tribe any money or other property due; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims, with the right of either party to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, to hear and determine all legal and equitable claims, if any, of said tribe against the United States and to enter judgment thereon.

SEC. 2. That if any claim or claims be submitted to said courts they shall settle the rights therein, both legal and equitable, of each and all the parties thereto notwithstanding lapse of time or statutes of limitation, and any payment which may have been made upon any claim so submitted shall not be pleaded as an estoppel, but may be pleaded as an offset in such suits or actions, and the United States shall be allowed credit for all sums, including gratuities, heretofore paid or expended for the benefit of said tribe or any band thereof. The claim or claims of the tribe, or band or bands thereof, may be presented separately or jointly by petition, subject, however, to amendment; suit to be filed within five years after the passage of this act, and such action shall make the petitioner or petitioners party plaintiff or plaintiffs and the United States party defendant; and any band or bands of said tribe, or any other tribe or band of Indians the court may deem necessary to a final determination of such suit or suits, may be joined therein as the court may order. Such petition, which shall be verified by the attorney or attorneys employed by said Klamath Tribe, or any bands thereof, shall set forth all the facts on which the claims for recovery are based, and said petition shall be signed by the attorney or attorneys employed, and no other verification shall be necessary. Official letters, papers, documents, and public records, or certified copies thereof, may be used in evidence, and the departments of the Government shall give access to the attorney or attorneys of said tribe or bands thereof to such treaties, papers, correspondence, or records as may be needed by the attorney or attorneys for said tribe or bands of Indians.

SEC. 3. That if it be determined by the Court of Claims in the said suit herein authorized that the United States Government has wrongfully appropriated any lands belonging to the said Klamath Tribe of Indians, damages therefor shall be confined to the value of the said land at the time of said appropriation, together with interest at 3 per cent per annum, and the decree of the Court of Claims with reference thereto, when satisfied, shall annul and cancel all claim and title of the said Klamath Tribe or any other tribe or band of Indians in and to said lands, as well as all damages for all wrongs and injuries, if any, committed by the Government of the United States with reference thereto.

SEC. 4. That upon the final determination of such suit, cause, or action, the Court of Claims shall decree such fees as it shall find reasonable to be paid the attorney or attorneys employed therein by said tribe or bands of Indians, under contracts negotiated and approved by existing law, and in no case shall the fee decreed by said Court of Claims be in excess of the amounts stipulated in the contracts approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, and no attorney shall have a right to represent the said tribe or any band thereof in any suit, cause, or action under the provisions of this act until his contract shall have been approved as herein provided. The fees decreed by the court to the attorney or attorneys of record shall be paid out of any sum or sums recovered in such suits or actions, and no part of such fee shall be taken from any money in the Treasury of the United States belonging to such

tribe or bands of Indians in whose behalf the suit is brought unless specifically authorized in the contract approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior as herein provided: *Provided*, That in no case shall the fees decreed by said court amount to more than 10 per cent of the amount of the judgment recovered in such cause.

The following committee amendments were severally read and agreed to:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "Klamath," insert "and Moadac."
 Line 4, strike out the word "Tribe" and insert in lieu thereof the word "Tribes," and after the word "Indians" insert "and the Yahoo-skin Band of Snake Indians, parties to the treaty with the United States, concluded October 14, 1864 (16 Stat. L., p. 707)."
 Page 2, line 2, strike out the word "tribe" and insert the word "Indians."
 Page 2, line 4, strike out the word "tribe" and insert the word "Indians."
 Page 2, line 5, strike out the word "tribe" and insert the word "Indians."
 Page 2, line 10, strike out the word "tribe" and insert the word "Indians."
 Page 2, line 21, strike out the word "tribe" and insert the word "Indians."
 Page 2, line 22, strike out the word "tribe" and insert the word "Indians."
 Page 3, line 2, strike out the word "tribe" and insert the word "Indians."
 Page 3, line 7, strike out the words "Klamath Tribe" and insert the word "Indians."
 Page 3, line 14, after the word "tribe," insert the word "Indians."
 Page 3, line 17, strike out the word "tribe" and insert the word "Indians."
 Page 3, line 21, strike out the words "Klamath Tribe of."
 Page 4, line 1, strike out the words "Klamath Tribe" and insert the word "Indians."
 Page 4, line 8, strike out the word "tribe" and insert the word "Indians."
 Page 4, line 14, strike out the word "tribe" and insert the word "Indians."
 Page 4, line 21, strike out the word "tribe" and insert the word "Indians."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER. A division is called for.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 58, noes 0.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. SINNOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

IOWA TRIBE OF INDIANS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 806) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Iowa Tribe of Indians against the United States.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on principles of justice and equity and as upon a full and fair arbitration of the claims of the Iowa Tribe of Indians, of Oklahoma, against the United States, with the right of appeal by either party to the Supreme Court of the United States, for the determination of the amount, if any, which may be legally or equitably due said tribe of Indians under any treaties or laws of Congress or under any stipulations or agreements, whether written or oral, entered into between said tribe of Indians and the United States or its authorized representatives, or for the failure of the United States to pay any money which may be legally or equitably due said tribe of Indians: *Provided*, That the court shall also consider and determine any legal or equitable defenses, set-offs, or counter claims which the United States may have against the said Iowa Tribe of Indians. A petition in behalf of said Indians shall be filed in the Court of Claims within one year after the passage of this act, and the Iowa Tribe of Indians shall be the party plaintiff and the United States the party defendant, and the petition may be verified by the attorney employed by the said Iowa Tribe of Indians to prosecute their claim under this act, under contract to be approved by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior, as provided by law, upon information and belief as to the facts alleged in said petition. Upon the final determination of the cause the Court of Claims shall decree such fees and expenses as the court shall find to be reasonably due to be paid to the attorney or attorneys employed by said Iowa Tribe of Indians, and the same shall be paid out of any sum or sums of money found due said Iowa Tribe of Indians: *Provided*, That in no case shall the fees and expenses decreed by said court be in excess of 10 per cent of the amount of the judgment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HERNANDEZ, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

ROOSEVELT NATIONAL PARK.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 5006) to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Park, Calif., and to change the name of said park to Roosevelt National Park.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Washington reserves the right to object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Before we proceed to consider this bill, Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to know what it is that is proposed to be done in this great park, where a million acres are to be added to it. There are to be no monopolies. Why should this national park be different from the other national parks in that respect?

Mr. ELSTON. The reason why an area of a million acres is included would be very easily understood if the gentleman had an appreciation of the topography of the country that will be taken in. I do not believe that there is any part of the territory that is on an average below 7,000 or 8,000 feet elevation. The whole of this area comprises what might be called an Alpine country. It is under a deep mantle of snow during eight months of the year. During three or four months of the year it is one of the grandest scenic places in the world. It comprises some of the most wonderful scenic features aggregated in any one locality in the United States or in America.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That being so, the land would still have all these scenic features, even if it remains as it is, as a part of a forest reserve. But if it is made into a park a man can not go in there with a fishhook or with a gun without becoming subject to the park regulations.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman has no doubt examined the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. I think I can assure him that those points have been pretty well covered in regard to the free entrance into the park and a reasonable use of their private holdings by settlers, mineral claimants, and all other kind of entrymen inside the park.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is not this bill simply extending the park provisions to a gigantic area, even though the gentleman says the bill is liberal in its provisions? As a matter of fact, all the regulations that now exist with regard to national parks will apply to this million acres added to it; and one reason for that, as I understand it, is that the mountain climbers from Los Angeles and San Francisco, in previous trips into the Sequoia National Park and then on in to northern California, have come upon valleys where they found sheep grazing. The sheep annoyed and interfered with the mountain climbers. Is not that one of the reasons?

Mr. ELSTON. That is decidedly not the reason.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Not a reason, but, perhaps, a cause of complaint.

Mr. ELSTON. If the gentleman will allow me to proceed a moment, I think I can disabuse his mind as to those points. Whatever objections the gentleman may have with regard to the application of the national-park act to other parks, there has been a particular set of rules inserted in this bill with respect to this park. These rules and regulations are very liberal, and they are intended to cover some of the objections that the gentleman has just made. I do not believe—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is just the point. You have a national-park system, very big, very large, and very good, but with lots of rules and regulations which are necessary, whether they are oppressive to some of the people or not; but here you propose to greatly enlarge a fine national park—to make it six or seven times as large as any other, and eliminate it from the application of the rules that apply to other national parks.

Mr. ELSTON. There might be good reason for that, which I can point out to the gentleman if he will wait a moment. This country is not a grazing country or a cattle country. I am speaking now in a general sense. It is merely a wild range of mountain country with extraordinary scenery. Running through this park are the great Kings and Kern Rivers. Their canyons are comparable to the Yosemite, except that they are grander in their proportions; they are wilder, and in some respects they outdo the Yosemite. As to the Yosemite, the falls and other scenic features are more concentrated, whereas in these canyons

of the Kern and Kings Rivers they are more distributed. The whole country is one mass of great giant mountain peaks, rugged upland, and deep canyons.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It is all under the control of the Forest Service, with rangers and everything else provided by the Government. Now, the proposed park control would be a more intensive control by the United States, with a rim of forest-reserve territory all around it still controlled by the Federal Government.

Mr. ELSTON. As I said, for eight or nine months of the year this whole country is covered by snow. In this area there are no settlements; there is not one person who can live in this region eight months in the year. There are no settlements except temporary settlements for three months in the year by cattlemen, who drive their herds up into the high mountain meadows. Compared with the great area involved the grazing values are almost negligible.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Has it not been stated by people who are in a position to know that the scenic features of this park exceed even those of the Alps?

Mr. ELSTON. That statement has been made by John Muir, the great naturalist, and it has been made by other people of like authority, and I do not think it can be controverted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But if the people are not in there nine months in the year and there are no inhabitants, as the gentlemen say, why can it not go along as it is, as a forest reserve, rather than be placed under a more intensive administration as a national park? The bill is entitled to an objection.

Mr. BARBOUR. I have an answer that will meet that.

Mr. ELSTON. I hope the gentleman will withhold objection for a moment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I will withhold my objection.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Did not Col. Graves, who was then the United States Forester, testify before the Committee on Public Lands that a large portion of this area—not all of it, but a large part of it—was suitable only for park purposes, or in words to that effect?

Mr. ELSTON. That was the testimony of the Chief Forester, and this bill has the approval of the Department of Agriculture and of Col. Graves himself.

The only question related to the elimination of certain areas which were thought to be better for grazing or for timber culture, and those objections have been substantially met by committee amendments.

Mr. FRENCH. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. FRENCH. I was wondering if it would be possible for waters to be stored in this proposed park for irrigation purposes?

Mr. ELSTON. Application of that kind could be entertained, and uses of that kind could be permitted in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. FRENCH. As I understand it, under the general law a right of way could be granted through a national forest reserve; but I do not understand that that could be done under the Secretary of the Interior through a national park, under a recent decision of the Secretary. I was wondering if the gentleman had taken that into consideration in framing the language of the bill?

Mr. ELSTON. This bill has been examined by all persons or associations in California that might be interested in the irrigation aspects of the case.

The fact is that the rivers and streams that come out of this territory come out at such an elevation and from such narrow canyons that it would be impossible to make any storage inside the lines of this proposed park. I have just stated that the western boundary line of this park on an average has an elevation of 7,000 or 8,000 feet. This territory is in the main range of the Sierra Nevada, reaching up to an elevation of 15,000 feet. So far as I know, there is practically no area inside of this proposed park that is suitable for the storage of water.

Mr. FRENCH. What I have in mind is this: I am in sympathy with the purposes of the bill, but it had been assumed with respect to some of the national parks that the Secretary of the Interior has authority to assist in the utilization of the water for economic uses, and then when a case was presented to him he felt that the law is actually not broad enough to give him that authority, and it seems to me that if there is any possible question of any future use covering the impounding of water, or the utilization of a right of way across a part

of this proposed national park for the diverting of water, we ought specifically to set it forth in the bill that the Secretary of the Interior shall have that authority, so that no question about it will ever arise in the future.

Mr. ELSTON. That matter has never been urged by any persons whose interests might be affected.

Mr. FRENCH. I make the suggestion so that if it is necessary at all it can be inserted, because the gentleman is the one whose people are interested in this proposition, and we ought not to overlook it if there is any possible chance of it ever being needed in the future.

Mr. BARBOUR. If the gentleman will yield to me on that point, I will state that I have never heard any suggestion of impounding waters in this area that it is proposed to include in the park, but I believe that in the forest areas farther down there are plenty of places to impound water, if it is necessary for irrigation, without going into this proposed park area.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] evidently overlooks a portion of the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture when he says this bill has the approval of the Secretary and of the forester. The Secretary of Agriculture expressly withholds his approval and says this legislation ought not to be enacted. He gives his reasons. He tells about the number of settlers on lands proposed by this bill to be included within the park. His words are:

The effect of the exclusion of cattle would be detrimental to many small ranches. There are within the area of the proposed park approximately 6,500 cattle and horses grazing under permit. A large part of the permittees are small men who have been undertaking to build up ranches in the foothills. In the majority of instances the privilege of grazing cattle in the national forest is essential to the success of maintaining these foothill homes; and the exclusion of these privileges will mean in a large number of cases not only great injury to these small ranchers but probably failure. It happens that most of the lands needed for the grazing of cattle are not of a scenic character that justifies their transfer to the status of a national park.

The net result of the investigations is to convince the department that the measure has not given sufficient consideration to broad economic interests of the region. Lands long withdrawn and established as national forests, which are chiefly valuable and urgently needed for timber production and forestry and for range utilization, should be maintained and administered as national forests unless some urgent public reason makes their transfer to another jurisdiction for some other use necessary. No such urgency or necessity is known to exist in this case.

The Secretary points out also that efforts have been made by himself and the Secretary of the Interior to reach an agreement, but that no agreement has been reached as to definite or satisfactory boundaries, and that until these boundaries be agreed upon and defined in such a way as not to affect injuriously these settlers or interfere with the proper administration of adjacent land in charge of the Forest Service, this legislation ought not to be adopted. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman withhold the objection for a moment until I can set him straight on one item?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will reserve the objection.

Mr. ELSTON. The letter of the Secretary of Agriculture, or at least the portion that the gentleman has read here, refers entirely to the boundaries. Col. Graves, who testified before the committee for the Secretary of Agriculture, had the following to say, and this was after the letter which the gentleman has read was presented to the committee. Col. Graves testified as follows, as appears on page 34 of the hearings:

The proposed park, I would like to say, in the first place, is one in which I am personally interested. I am in favor of a park which will include the great scenic features of the Mount Whitney region and the region of Kings and Kern Rivers. It seems to me also that it is very appropriate that this park should be named after Theodore Roosevelt.

Col. Graves and the Department of Agriculture objected only to the boundaries. These boundaries have been adjusted down to a point where they substantially agree with the suggestions made by Col. Graves. We eliminated nearly 200,000 acres after the introduction of this bill, to comply with the suggestions of Col. Graves.

The gentleman has referred to the settlers in the area of the park. The settlers mentioned in the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture refer to settlers in the San Joaquin Valley outside the proposed park. They have been in the habit of sending small herds up into the mountain for the summer forage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. There are private holders of land, and the minute this becomes a park up will come the demand that the Government buy them out.

Mr. ELSTON. There were large timber holdings, but we have eliminated them. There are no private holdings in there that the Government would want. There are some mineral holdings, but they have been properly safeguarded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But sooner or later they will have to be sold to the Government.

Mr. ELSTON. If the gentleman will look at the hearings and report he will find that the idea of this park has been indorsed quite universally.

I would refer to the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR], who represents the district in which this park is located. He represents the settlers which the Secretary of Agriculture has mentioned in his letter. If the gentleman wants any assurance as to the fact that these settlers are safeguarded, the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] would be able to advise how far this bill impinges on their rights. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. BARBOUR] will say that the bill is meritorious and the rights of his constituents are protected.

Mr. BARBOUR. It is on that point that I asked if the gentleman would yield for a moment. The Secretary of Agriculture wrote the letter which the gentleman from Michigan has read when the bill was first submitted and when the original bill was being considered by the Committee on Public Lands. In order to take care of the stockmen whom he mentioned, I offered this amendment, which is the proviso on page 12.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is my objection to the bill. It proposes to create a hybrid, neither a park nor a forest reserve. It wants all of the benefits and none of the responsibilities.

Mr. BARBOUR. It is proposed to take in a large area of land, but it will not be developed for park purposes for several years to come.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If there are no people in there except for the little grazing that goes on there, why put so many of the regulations of the national-park system into effect?

Mr. BARBOUR. Because it is necessary, if you are ever to make it a park, to start sometime. The proposition has been before Congress for six years. If the gentleman objects to the liberality of the provisions of the bill—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I do not. But I do believe that some of the great beauty spots of the West should be left so that a man may bait a fishhook or shoot a gun without violating some park regulation.

Mr. BARBOUR. I agree with the gentleman on that proposition, and it was with that idea of taking care of the grazing interests that I offered the amendment before the Committee on the Public Lands which permits grazing on this land at the same fees as is charged by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some serious disagreement as to the boundaries of this park and forest reserve. The gentleman from California [Mr. ELSTON] says there are to be further conferences and that they are to submit further amendments. Under these circumstances this bill ought not to be passed by unanimous consent, and I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan objects, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

IRRIGATION EASEMENTS IN YELLOWSTONE NATIONAL PARK.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12466) authorizing the granting of certain irrigation easements in the Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman withhold his objection for a short time?

Mr. TINKHAM. I withhold my objection until the gentleman can make a statement.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I wish the opportunity of explaining to the Members of the House the importance of enacting this legislation. We have just been considering a bill which proposes to add to a national park in California over a million acres of land. This bill is one to permit the use of 8,000 acres of land in the southwestern corner of the Yellowstone National Park, which, according to engineers' reports and the topographical maps of the United States Geological Survey, are near the center of a swamp, covering possibly 100,000 acres. This [pointing] is an enlarged map of the southwestern corner of the Yellowstone National Park. In the eastern section of the State of Idaho, adjoining, there are 200,000 acres of land that are partially irrigated from the reservoir sites at the heads of the streams, as will be observed by the map. Because of the lack of snow in the mountains a year ago there was such a shortage of water for irrigation purposes that over \$10,000,000 worth of crops were lost last season. At the present time, on account of the lack of hay, resulting from a shortage of water for irrigation, the cattle are starving in that section of the country, as is evidenced by a newspaper item in the daily Idaho Statesman of April 13. Hay dealers are sending into

that country hundreds of carloads of hay from the western part of Idaho to feed the starving cattle in the eastern portion, the shortage in hay, as stated, being caused by the lack of water for irrigation purposes last season. This map shows the relative size of the two reservoirs it is proposed to construct. It also shows the roads leading into and through Yellowstone National Park and their remoteness from the sites of the proposed reservoirs. There are three entrances, one from the west, one from the north, and one from the east. The proposed reservoirs are not within 40 miles of the entrance on the west and is removed from the eastern entrance and northern entrance the whole width of the park. The general right-of-way law which applies to the public lands does not apply to the Yellowstone National Park or to other national parks, and special legislation is necessary.

It is just a question of whether the Congress is willing to allow the farmers living in eastern Idaho to build reservoirs at their own expense to save for irrigation purposes the snow and rain which God Almighty sends for all of us or whether a few splendid but overly esthetic people, so far as the western country is concerned, who are living in luxury in Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and other eastern cities, and who apparently have little interest or sympathy for those of limited means who are trying to build homes for themselves and families on the arid lands, are to be permitted to make it possible by defeating this legislation for these hardy pioneers who are reclaiming the desert to lose ten or fifteen million dollars worth of crops each year. These worthy people are just as much entitled to the use of this water as they are to the air and sunshine. If we enact this legislation, the farmers will construct the reservoirs without cost to the Government to store sufficient water for irrigation purposes to insure a bountiful crop, the food supply will be increased for all the people, and the country generally will be benefited.

The only site available for such storage is in the extreme southwestern corner of the Yellowstone National Park, a section which is marshy in its character and which is never visited by tourists because of the lack of roads or trails. Application was made to the Secretary of the Interior for a right of way for a reservoir under the general law affecting easements on the public domain, and after careful consideration the Secretary stated he was in doubt in regard to his authority to grant such a permit of easement under the general law and submitted proposed legislation, which is embodied in the bill under consideration, which gives the Secretary of the Interior authority to grant the necessary right of way in the extreme southwestern corner of the Yellowstone National Park for the construction of a reservoir, canals, and so forth, for the purpose of storing water for the purpose of irrigation.

It is specifically provided that the road to be constructed from the park boundary to the site of the reservoir shall be maintained at the expense of the grantees, who shall also permit the use of any telephone or telegraph lines which may be constructed. Also that timber within the limits of the reservoir shall be cut and removed so as not to mar the attractiveness of the reservoir, and that all plans and specifications shall be submitted and approved by the Secretary of the Interior before construction. Also that the Secretary of the Interior shall make and enforce rules and regulations necessary to carry into force and effect the purposes of the act, and to protect and preserve, in so far as consistent therewith, the beauty of said park.

The proposed legislation simply confers upon the Secretary of the Interior authority to approve the application for a right of way if, in his judgment, such action should be taken.

The approval of the Acting Secretary of the Interior of the proposed legislation is set forth in the following letter addressed to the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, March 6, 1920.

Hon. N. J. SINNOTT,
Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SINNOTT: I have your request of February 13 for a report on H. R. 12466, entitled "A bill authorizing the granting of certain irrigation easements in Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes."

I have carefully examined this measure in the light of the policies of this department with respect to the protection of the natural conditions of the national parks, and I have reached the conclusion that no objection to the passage of the bill should be interposed by me, for the reason that no easements for irrigation purposes in the Fall River Basin, Yellowstone National Park, must be granted by the Secretary of the Interior under the provisions of this legislation unless he first finds that such easements will not bring detriment to or interference with the uses of the land involved for park purposes.

Cordially, yours,

ALEXANDER T. VOGELSANG,
Acting Secretary.

The reasons upon which the importance of the proposed legislation is based are as follows:

1. There are about 30,000 people residing on farms, which are now in a high state of development and cultivation and in need of additional water supply in order to secure the maximum crops. The area affected is about 200,000 acres, situated in Fremont and Madison Counties, Idaho.

Except during dry years, these lands are fairly well supplied with water, but during the periods of drought a great shortage of crops are experienced.

2. A careful examination of the watershed has been made by the officials of the State of Idaho and the engineers, which examinations disclose the fact that this reservoir site in the Yellowstone National Park on Fall River is the only site which can be utilized in providing an additional water supply for the land in question.

3. On account of the peculiar conditions surrounding this site, its location, etc., the reservoir can be constructed and operated without any interferences whatever with the park.

The area intended to be used by this reservoir is of a swampy character and contains nothing whatever of interest. When this reservoir is constructed, this swamp will be converted into a beautiful mountain lake.

4. There is absolutely nothing in the way of unusual scenery or other interesting features in this part of the park, but the entire area contains only the ordinary western mountain landscape scenes, such as may be seen along the lines of travel for many miles by any tourist approaching the park from any direction.

This part of the park is not on the line of tourist travel and is never visited by the tourists on account of the topographic conditions; none of the tourist routes through the park ever reach this territory, as there is nothing of unusual interest to induce the tourist travel to visit this section.

During recent years, particularly 1919, a considerable menace existed to the entire Yellowstone National Park from forest fires. One of the fires most difficult to control occurred at the headwaters of Fall River and was only extinguished with great difficulty owing to a lack of roads and a means of access. When this easement is granted, a highway will be constructed from the railroad station at Ashton or Marysville to this part of the park, in order that they may gain access to their work. This highway will serve as a means of access to the park for fire protection and other purposes for all time to come.

5. Like many of the other Western States, Idaho is dependent entirely on the development of its agricultural resources by irrigation for further growth and prosperity. This development can only progress by the conservation of our water resources through the construction of storage reservoirs. Such reservoirs obviously can only be constructed where favorable sites exist and where adequate water supply is available.

6. Little need be said concerning the necessity of increasing the food production of the Nation and the world, but the following brief summary covers the crop production from this territory: Sugar beets, wheat, oats, and barley, peas, and other seeds, together with large quantities of forage for cattle and sheep, and potatoes and other vegetables are grown in large quantities.

The aggregate loss in crop failures, due to the shortage of water during 1919 on the lands which it is intended to irrigate from this reservoir, not including the loss in cattle, sheep, and other live stock, aggregated more than \$15,000,000.

The growing of sugar beets as an industry in this part of the country is one of the most important, and owing to the shortage of water, all of which would have been avoided had this reservoir been in existence, this crop was not more than 40 per cent of the normal during 1919. The estimated loss of sugar beets in this territory during that year is about \$5,000,000.

7. This reservoir site is not desired by any corporate interest for corporate profit, but by the farmers, who are organized and will furnish all the money to construct the necessary works, and its use will be entirely devoted to the creation of happy farm life and prosperity. At this particular time when extreme congestion occurs in our cities and congested centers of population, it is highly important that special inducement be offered to increase the rural population and relieve these congested centers.

8. At a time when the world is largely filled with unrest, due to the radical activities in Russia and elsewhere, to say nothing of our own Nation, it is well to remember that the owners of farm property and the people who are tilling their own soil are not radicals, but really constitute our most loyal and patriotic American citizens. In this respect it is, therefore, important to further increase our farm areas and build up our rural communities.

When this reservoir is constructed, the adequate water supply provided thereby and the increased production resulting therefrom will permit of material reduction in the present farm units in this territory and thus build up additional homes for many people.

Mr. Arthur P. Davis, Director of the Reclamation Service, who has visited this section of the park, stated to the committee that this section is of a marshy character, and that it is of the greatest importance that the water be conserved as proposed for irrigation purposes. The director has also submitted the following letter:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
UNITED STATES RECLAMATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., March 18, 1920.

HON. ADDISON T. SMITH,

Acting Chairman Committee on the Public Lands,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: In accordance with your request over the telephone this morning, I am submitting the following information concerning the reservoir site known as Fall River Meadows or Bechler Swamp in the southwestern corner of Yellowstone Park.

This site is desired for the storage of water for irrigation by farmers along the North Fork of Snake River in Idaho, and it is well adapted to the purpose. The region is partly covered with timber of little value and is, in general, swampy. A low range of hills passes through the swampy area, and by closing the gaps in these hills it is possible to store a large quantity of water for irrigation. The land that would be submerged by the lake thus formed is mostly of a swampy nature and is unsightly and without any scenic value or economic value that is comparable to its value as a reservoir.

The lake that would be formed would be more pleasing to the eye than the natural swamp and would eliminate a considerable area of mosquito-breeding territory. If the embankments proposed to form this reservoir are built in a workmanlike manner and the construction camps and equipments properly cleaned up, the proposed work will be a distinct improvement in the appearance of the region and the roads that will be necessary to construct and operate this reservoir will increase the accessibility of the southwestern portion of the park. I know of no valid objection, either of a scenic or economic nature, to the proposed construction, and think by all means it should be allowed and encouraged by Congress.

Very truly, yours,

A. P. DAVIS, Director.

Mr. Stephen T. Mather, Director of the National Park Service, also addressed the committee and recommended the passage of the bill, with the statement that before the Secretary acted upon the application for a right of way, he and the superintendent of the national park would visit the Fall River Basin country and furnish the Secretary of the Interior full information, which would enable him to take appropriate action on the application.

Many statements have been furnished the committee from farmers and others as to the value of crops lost last season because of the shortage of water supply, which would have been saved had the proposed reservoir been constructed and water conserved for such an emergency in the way of the shortage of water as existed last summer, a few of which are as follows:

STATEMENT OF DROUGHT CONDITIONS DURING THE SEASON OF 1919 IN THE UPPER SNAKE RIVER VALLEY.

ASHTON, IDAHO, November 1, 1919.

I am farming 640 acres just south of Ashton; 300 acres sown to wheat, which with irrigation water available would have yielded not less than 12,000 bushels, brought 1,761 bushels; 250 acres sown to seed peas, which should have brought not less than 9,000 bushels, yielded 327 bushels, or considerably less than half the amount of seed planted; 20 acres of barley yielded 28 bushels, less than the amount of seed used; 32 acres of alfalfa hay, which with the ordinary amount of irrigation water available should have brought not less than 160 tons, brought 30 tons of very inferior hay.

The season of 1919, with its abundance of sunshine and warm weather, should have been a record-breaking year, if farmers of this section could have only enjoyed the usual amount of water for irrigating their crops. The above estimates of yields are based on what my experience of 20 years of farming here leads me to expect and are low. Any season, when the farmers here are compelled to allow the waters in the rivers to go by and supply older rights, the same crop failure will virtually recur.

To reasonably safeguard future farming operations in this section, it is absolutely necessary to augment the present supply of irrigation water. The only location that is left would be the reservoir site in Fall River meadows.

G. HARRISFIELD.

STATE OF IDAHO,
County of Madison, ss:

We, the undersigned, president and secretary of the Teton Island Canal Co., an irrigation corporation existing and operating in Madison County, State of Idaho, do hereby certify as follows:

That our losses on account of shortage of water during the year 1919 have at least been one-half of our entire crop and that we are badly in need of stored water for irrigation purposes, and we must have stored water to properly irrigate all tillable land under present irrigation system, and unless we provide stored waters our losses will continue to be great hereafter. And we will be short of water the years that our snowfall is light.

We, the president and secretary of the above corporation, certify that the above statement is true and correct.

ALFRED RICKS, President.

JAMES A. BERRY, Secretary.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 5th day of November, 1919.
[SEAL.] W. E. GEE,

Notary Public, Rexburg, Idaho.

My commission expires January 16, 1922.

STATE OF IDAHO,
County of Madison, ss:

Ross J. Comstock, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:
That he is the president of the First National Bank of Rexburg, Madison County, State of Idaho, and has for the past 19 years lived continuously in the said Madison County.

That during all the said time he has been identified with said bank and its predecessors, and that in the managing of said business he is personally and well acquainted with the irrigation conditions of said county.

The affiant further states that located in Madison County are 80,000 acres of irrigated lands which are capable of being irrigated from the water supply of the North Fork of Snake and Teton Rivers; that during the said time, on numerous occasions, more or less of said lands have suffered from lack of irrigation water, and the farmers have sustained material losses through failure to secure necessary water for irrigation purposes.

The affiant further states that this has been especially the condition during the irrigation of 1919 and that all of said lands have suffered from lack of water for irrigation, and he would estimate that said loss would exceed \$25 to \$100 per acre, with a probable general average of \$35 to \$40 per acre.

The affiant further states that in the development of said Madison County that the more scientific farming and the diversification of crops requires that a greater amount of water be provided than in former years and that it is apparent that the only manner in which said water can be provided and due protection given to the irrigation districts of Madison County is through the storage of water at the heads of the water supply that flow through the valley, and released during the time that the regular flow of the rivers will not supply a sufficient amount of water for irrigation purposes.

The affiant further states that the irrigated portions of Madison County being subirrigated, that by reason of filling the ground to raise the water table to properly subirrigate said lands, creates a reservoir or storage of water and the return flow to the river is immeasurably valuable to the irrigation districts below.

R. J. COMSTOCK.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 5th day of November, 1919.
[SEAL.] FAY ABBOTT.

I, Joseph E. Romrell, hereby depose and say that I am president of the Wilford Irrigation & Manufacturing Co., of Wilford, Fremont County, Idaho. That said company is a cooperative and non-speculative corporation operated solely for the purpose of irrigating the lands owned by the members of the company. That there are over 2,000 acres of cultivated land under the company's canal owned and operated by the stockholders of the corporation. That the value of the land of said tract ranges from \$125 to \$200 per acre. That due to scarcity of water during the present year of 1919 the farmers comprising this company have lost \$150,500 worth of crops, as follows:

Wheat	\$68,000
Oats	6,500
Seed peas	50,000
Alfalfa hay	15,000
Grain straw and pea straw	3,000
Miscellaneous crops	8,000
Total	150,500

That we suffer yearly a shortage of water and extremely so such years as 1898, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1918, and the present year.

That we have joined in the formation of the Fremont-Madison Reservoir Co., subscribing \$20,000 stock therein, or 5,000 shares at \$4 per share, applying for 5,000 acre-feet of water annually, through said reservoir company.

Witness my hand and seal at Wilford (St. Anthony, R. F. D. No. 1), Fremont County, Idaho, this 12th day of November, 1919.
JOSEPH E. ROMRELL.

STATE OF IDAHO,
County of Fremont, ss:

On this 13th day of November, in the year 1919, before me, Walter Riggs, a notary public in and for the State of Idaho, personally appeared Joseph E. Romrell, known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed to the foregoing instrument and acknowledged to me that he executed the same.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal the day and year in this certificate first above written at Teton, Idaho.
[SEAL.] WALTER RIGGS, Notary Public.

STATE OF IDAHO,
County of Fremont, ss:

I, E. Cunningham, being duly sworn, say that I am a resident of Ashton, Idaho; that I have lived here since 1906. I am a farmer by occupation and know the conditions existing in this country relative to the aridity and need of irrigation water.

During the years 1910, 1916, 1917, 1919, it was extremely dry in this section of the country and the crops were very short in the three first-named years, and practically a failure in the last-named year for the lack of irrigation water. The crops grown here are very small grains, hay, peas, beets, and vegetables. It is impossible to successfully grow hay, peas, beets, or any vegetables in almost any year without irrigation. This section of country, being among the last to be settled in the Snake River Valley, found the water all appropriated before it was settled, leaving us nothing but flood water. In order to overcome this shortage of water it is absolutely necessary that we be enabled to secure storage facilities to hold the flood water in order that we may be able to get the necessary water for irrigation.

E. CUNNINGHAM.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 3d day of November, 1919.
[SEAL.] HIRAM G. FULLER, Notary Public.

ST. ANTHONY, IDAHO, October 30, 1919.

To whom it may concern:

We affirm that G. A. Fitzpatrick has been the manager of the St. Anthony Flour Mills, of St. Anthony, Idaho, and has resided at St. Anthony, Idaho, for the past six years, and that, as such manager, he has had occasion, due to the nature and interests of the grain business, to observe, more or less, the shortage of irrigation water at St. Anthony and in the surrounding vicinity. We further affirm that during the

growing season of 1919 there was such a shortage of irrigating water in this part of Idaho that only about 15 per cent of a normal crop was grown, which could have been avoided if proper reservoir facilities were provided to take care of the flood waters in the spring of the year.

This is not the only year that this has occurred, as two years ago the same condition existed, but not nearly as severe as during the year 1919, as there were not as many acres under crop then as during the present year. This also was true in the year 1913, but the shortage was not as severe as in the years 1917 and 1919. This is due also to the fact that there was not nearly as large an acreage planted as during the war period, when each farmer exerted every effort to plant every available acre that was possible. It is true, however, that the irrigation water is not sufficient to grow successfully crops throughout this district without reservoir reservation of water, and for St. Anthony and surrounding territory to be successful there must, in the very near future, be obtained reservoir facilities large enough to store the flood waters in the spring to take care of this later demand, as it is the late water that matures the crops and makes the country successful.

Very truly, yours,

ST. ANTHONY FLOUR MILLS,
By G. A. FITZPATRICK, Manager.

EVERETT B. CLARK SEED CO.,
St. Anthony, Idaho, October 29, 1919.

John B. Davis, manager of the Everett B. Clark Seed Co., St. Anthony, Idaho, being first duly sworn deposes and says:

Following is a summary of our books of seed sown and crops grown from same during the past six years:

Year.	Pounds seed sown.	Pounds crop harvested.	Average fold.
1914.....	780,660	3,602,371	4.613
1915.....	606,162	3,447,395	5.685
1916.....	773,304	2,750,160	3.556
1917.....	786,520	2,138,808	2.703
1918.....	813,176	3,064,688	3.646
1919.....	761,226	1,645,865	2.162

The pea-growing sections in the United States as I know it are as follows: Parts of Wisconsin, Michigan, Montana, Washington, and Idaho. The two former are strictly dry-farm propositions, Washington partly, Montana and Idaho under irrigation, and without it very few, if any, peas can be successfully grown.

The Snake River Valley in Idaho has an ideal climate for pea growing, and with plenty of water it has no equal in the pea-growing game. Have been interested in pea growing in Canada, New York, Wisconsin, and Idaho, and have visited other sections during growing seasons.

Just to show what the scarcity of water did to some crops in this section this year: One of our growers, John F. Johnson, of St. Anthony, had two crops of peas for us, one crop that he had some water for—not enough, but enough to water parts of the field once. We paid him \$1,057.85 for that, and for the other that he had no water at all for he owed us \$108.94 for seed furnished him. In both cases land was the same. Cause: Shortage of water.

Others who had partial water:
J. S. Rudd, Parker, Idaho—from 60 acres we paid him \$5,547.69.

Frank Fujimoto, St. Anthony—from 35 acres we paid him \$2,907.10.

C. W. Brown, St. Anthony—from 20 acres we paid him \$1,742.32.

Others with just as good land and farmers:
Paul Allan Parker—17 acres; did not get seed back.

T. W. Barger, Newdale—16 acres; total failure.

Seth Beam, Newdale—40 acres; total failure on as good land as ever lay outdoors.

Could go on and cite dozens of others in the same boat, but this will show conditions. At Ashton, Idaho, normally without best producing sections, this year almost a total failure.

We are unable to give actual loss to the farmers or ourselves owing to water shortage this year, but it runs into the thousands of dollars. Our own loss is extremely large, not only in dollars but in the loss of seed stocks that we have been years in breeding up and perhaps we may never be able to replace.

Respectfully submitted,

JNO. B. DAVIS, Manager.

STATE OF IDAHO,
County of Fremont, ss:

Daniel Thomas, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he is a resident of Fremont County, State of Idaho, and a citizen of the United States, over the age of 21 years. That he has resided at Ashton, Idaho, since November, 1916, and is one of the co-partners of the firm of Thomas Bros., grain buyers, with elevators at Ashton, Grainville, Driggs, Felt, and Hetonia, Idaho; that he has been engaged in the buying of grain for years, prior to 1916, in the State of Kansas. That during the year of 1917 the firm of Thomas Bros. purchased at their elevators approximately 600,000 bushels of small grain, of the approximate value of \$1,000,000; that during the year of 1918 they purchased approximately the same amount, and of the same approximate value; that in the year 1919 they will be able to purchase, due to the fact that there is no more in the country, not to exceed 30,000 bushels, of the approximate value of \$45,000. The great difference in the amount purchased is due to the fact that in the year 1919 the shortage of water was so great that the canals of this section were shut off for the benefit of prior appropriators early in July of 1919; that this shortage of water has each year become more acute, due to the fact that sections with prior water right have become more highly developed, have used more intensive farming methods, entered industries requiring more water, and have become more densely populated.

That at the points where the firm of Thomas Bros., have elevators, other firms have elevators, whose purchases this affiant has no means of determining definitely but would judge ran about the same in volume and value as that of Thomas Bros.; that from his experience in the buying and handling of grain in other sections of the country your affiant is able to state that from his experience the section around Ashton is unsurpassed for the raising of small grain by any other section, either in quantity of yield per acre or in quality.

That the soil of this section is very fertile and productive, adapted to the raising of various products, for which markets are being established, and is susceptible of being easily irrigated; that due to the establish-

ment of markets for various products, which are being raised, and which will require irrigation more extensively than small grain has heretofore, more water than formerly is going to be required for the proper development of the country, so that instead of the present supply of water becoming more adequate by the change to production other than the raising of grain, such supply will become further inadequate; that to insure the future development of this section, or even to maintain its present development, the waters that pass by in winter months will be required to be stored, and your affiant verily believes that the only solution to the problem is the construction of the proposed reservoir for storage water in Fall River Meadows, in Yellowstone Park; that by such construction, the future development of Upper Snake River Valley is assured, but that without such construction, this section must become of no great importance in production.

DANIEL W. THOMAS,

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 1st day of November, 1919.
[SEAL.] THOS. B. HARGIS, Notary Public.

STATE OF IDAHO,

County of Fremont, ss:

W. L. Miller, being first duly sworn, deposes and says:

That he is the president and general manager of Miller Bros. Co., a corporation of the State of Idaho, engaged in the business of buying and selling grain.

That he has been engaged in the grain business in the city of St. Anthony continuously since the year 1900, and during all that time has bought and sold grain, and at times potatoes, hay, and feed. That during a large portion of the time he has been engaged in business the concern has operated and now are operating at seven different points on the branch of the Oregon Short Line Railroad, running from Idaho Falls, Idaho, to Yellowstone, Wyo., and to Victor, Idaho, all of which points, with the exception of one, are in the irrigated section of the Upper Snake River Valley and in the territory irrigated by the waters of Fall River and the North and South Forks of Snake River and tributaries.

That in the early period of the time that he has been engaged in said business the territory tributary to the points at which they operate produced largely grain, but of recent years the crops produced in this territory become very much diversified, and since more and difficult kinds of crops have been raised, such as sugar beets, potatoes, seed peas, etc., and the grain crops have steadily declined in acreage.

That the crops last above mentioned require irrigation later in the year than do the grain crops, and several years have occurred in which the crops of beets, potatoes, peas, and other late crops have not properly matured because of the lack of sufficient water in the latter part of the season, and particularly in the years 1916 and 1919, during which years the crops of grain and also the later maturing crops suffered extensively from want of irrigation, the crop of 1916 being estimated as 50 per cent short and the crop of 1919 being estimated as no more than 15 per cent of the normal yield for the territory embraced in the operations of his company. That the shortage of crop was due to no other apparent cause than the shortage of water, as is evidenced by the fact that the crops on the heads of the canals, where it was possible to obtain a sufficient supply of water and before any great loss had occurred by evaporation and seepage, were normally good, while the crops on the lower end of the same canals were, in some instances, particularly in the year 1915, a total failure.

W. L. MILLER.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a notary public, residing at St. Anthony, Idaho, this 29th day of October, 1919.
[SEAL.] NORA E. CARROLL.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. In addition to what the gentleman has said, from the settled community to the boundary line of the park and then into the park, at quite an enormous expense, these people are to build and maintain roads and telephone lines?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. That is provided in the bill, and the Government is to have the use of these roads and telephone lines without any expense whatever to it.

Mr. RAKER. In addition to that, the entire surrounding territory where the reservoirs are is to be kept in proper shape?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. To harmonize with the park and to be kept up at the expense of the reservoir people?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes. In the southwestern section of the park there are no roads or trails. No white man goes into that section of the country. It is a mountainous section, except in the southwestern corner, where there are nothing but swamps. The farmers propose to put a reservoir in the swamp section to conserve the water to augment the water supply to irrigate 200,000 acres in the eastern part of Idaho.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will this project interfere in any way with the scenic beauties of that part of the park, or with the accessibility of that part of it?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It could not possibly interfere with the scenic features. A lake is certainly more attractive than a swamp. A fine wagon road will be built in from the railroad to this section over which to transport material to construct the reservoir, and under the provisions of the bill the organized farmers must keep the roads in good condition. Eventually the Park Service could build roads to connect with other roads in the park.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Has there been at any other time any effort to commercialize any part of the Yellowstone Park?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Not to my knowledge, except that about 20 years ago there was introduced a bill to build a railroad into the park. This is legislation intended to save the crops of 6,000 farmers situated on 200,000 acres of land, where now about 30,000 people live.

Mr. TREADWAY. I want to ask the gentleman further, whether or not this could not be used a little later on as a precedent for other efforts along the same or a similar line that might gradually take a slice here and there off of the beauty and attractions of the park?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. That same argument might apply to any legislation or anything that we do. If we do something that is wise, we should do it because it appeals to our judgment, even if it establishes a precedent. Each proposition must stand or fall on its own merits.

Mr. FRENCH. I would like to ask the gentleman if it was not supposed the Secretary of the Interior had discretionary power to do this particular thing; in fact, the Secretary of the Interior about 1895 made a ruling practically on the same proposition applied to another park, holding that he did have that authority.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The general right-of-way law was supposed to apply to the parks as well as to the public domain, but recently the Secretary concluded it did not.

Mr. TREADWAY. It is very fortunate that there is no such discretion given any official so far as the Yellowstone Park is concerned.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. May I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts a question? Is it more important that this swampy portion of the park should be preserved as sacred than that 200,000 acres of land should be put under complete and intensive cultivation and support 30,000 people who are there now and the 100,000 who will be there within the next few years?

Mr. TREADWAY. Answering the gentleman's question, I call his attention to his own report wherein he says that ordinarily there is ample water there. "Except during dry years these lands are fairly well supplied with water, but during the period of drought a great shortage of crops is experienced." It does not seem to me the gentleman there makes out a very strong case.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Possibly a drought may come next year, which will result in another loss of \$10,000,000 worth of food-stuffs and bring discouragement and possibly bankruptcy to thousands of people who are on these lands.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I do.

Mr. RAKER. Now, the grant in this bill of the right of way is protected in the bill and is under the control of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The interests of the Government are protected just as specifically as the language could possibly be made.

Mr. RAKER. And the roads are to be built under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. And the telephone lines the same.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. The dam and structures are to be built to harmonize with the rest of the park as nearly as it is possible to be done.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Certainly.

Mr. RAKER. And at the expense of these farmers below?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Entirely. It will not cost the Government a cent.

Mr. RAKER. Is there a foot of land which by virtue of its being thus taken will detract from the park?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Absolutely not. The proposed improvement will be a benefit to the park and result in saving the water which is necessary to use on this desert land during the hot, long summer to raise crops.

Mr. RAKER. And this is just a swamp and mosquito pond at the present time? It will be transformed into a beautiful lake in the park, where these people and others may go to visit?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes, sir.

Mr. SNELL. I understand there are 100,000 acres of swamp.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes, approximately.

Mr. SNELL. How can you make a reservoir of 9,000 acres on 100,000 acres of swamp?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. We expect to build the dam between the hills and back the water up over this swamp.

Mr. SNELL. How much do they expect to back up the water?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. On 8,000 acres.

Mr. SNELL. How many feet high—how high?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. On an average of 10 or 15 feet.

Mr. SNELL. What kind of timber is on the land?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Director Davis, of the Reclamation Service, who has recommended the enactment of this bill strongly, states that there is no merchantable timber there. The bill provides that any timber there shall be removed from the reservoir site so there will not be any tree tops sticking up out of the water to mar the beauty of the lakes to be created.

It is proposed that roads shall be constructed in an artistic way, and great effort will be made to make the reservoirs attractive to the people who may possibly come into this section of the country when the roads are connected up in the park.

Mr. SNELL. What is the attraction for people to go into a section of country where they can not live?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. There is no attraction there.

Mr. SNELL. That seems to be the situation almost with all parts of Idaho.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. There are many scenic beauties in the Yellowstone National Park which are now reached by roads without going into this remote section consisting of swamps.

Mr. BARBOUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is it not a fact now that there are no roads going into that area?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No; and no trails by which tourists might go in there. Occasionally white men may go in there to hunt.

Mr. BARBOUR. Is it not a further fact that this could be made an asset to the park, whereas it is now a liability?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes, sir.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman please point out where the agricultural land is?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho (indicating on map). This land in eastern Idaho is the agricultural land to be supplied from that reservoir.

Mr. RAKER. That is south and west of the proposed dam?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. There is no road leading through this section up to the proposed reservoir?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No; it is difficult to get in there. There is a trail up which possibly a wagon could go.

Mr. RAKER. But no automobile road?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No.

Mr. RAKER. How many people approximately live in this section who could be expected, if this road is built in there, to get the benefit of the park as well as everybody else that comes into that country?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Of course there are thousands of people living in eastern Idaho who might take advantage of it, but the people I am especially interested in are those who have homes and farms on this land, who are entitled to have this water, which the Almighty has placed there for their use, and which now runs unused to the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. RAKER. And this would help in the development of the park itself?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Absolutely so.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I will yield.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It seems to me that any canal or ditch company or association or corporation formed there who acquires the right to build and the use of that property, practically acquires title in fee of the area covered by the water that is collected there?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. They would have the same sort of fee that a railroad has when it is granted a right of way across the public domain.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. A private corporation is permitted practically to carry on business just as they please as far as the use of water by themselves and others are concerned, and they have that perpetual right against everybody else. Is that the idea?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. There is nobody else who could utilize the water other than the people living on the land below.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Somebody else might make use of it.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. In any event, the laws provide that those who first utilize the water are entitled to it, and it is a question, as I say, whether or not this Congress is going to permit these farmers to save the rain and snow, which is supposed to be free to everybody, or deprive them of the opportunity of storing it for use as it is needed.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I think everyone wishes them to have permission to use that and to have assistance in using it, but it seems to me a serious proposition to give the first one there the right for all time over that area.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Nobody else could use it but those living in that area.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The one who gets there first can control it and direct how everybody else can use it for all time.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Nobody else could use it except the farmers who are located there.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. In reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN], I would like to ask the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH] if the lands sought to be watered by the waters of that reservoir indicated are organized under the laws of the State of Idaho into an irrigation district?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes, sir; there are several districts organized, and they have a central organization and are raising the money among themselves to make the proposed improvements.

Mr. TIMBERLAKE. Then it involves all the people who belong in that district, and no individual would suffer or have any special rights such as suggested by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It is for the benefit of the people who are now on the land and who, because of these shortages in snowfall, occasionally find that they have not sufficient water to save their crops.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman from Idaho yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 5006 retain its place on the Unanimous Consent Calendar according to the regular procedure.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Not to be brought up again to-day?

Mr. ELSTON. Not to be brought up again to-day.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. With that understanding, I will not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TINKHAM. Will the honorable Representative from Idaho yield?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following communication from the American Civic Association, and it was upon their communication and also one from Frederick Law Olmstead that I make objection. I think the honorable Representative from Idaho is entitled to hear what those communications contain, as is the committee. Referring to the bill now before the committee, the communication from the American Civic Association says:

The act in question seems to us who are interested in the preservation of the Yellowstone National Park in accordance with the purpose manifested in the act of March 1, 1872, when it was set aside, to be a very unfortunate and improper attempt to exploit for the benefit of a comparatively few persons the precious and unreplaceable property of the whole Nation.

We also believe that it is an erroneous and indefensible procedure to refer the determination of this matter to the Secretary of the Interior, for if Congress knew its own mind when it set aside the Yellowstone National Park as such, it certainly ought to have the opportunity to change the ideals concerning that park without depending upon an administrative official.

I also draw your attention to the report accompanying Mr. Smith's bill, in which the claim is made that the consummation of the park destruction aimed at would largely increase the product of certain agricultural operators in the lower and contiguous portions of Idaho. On page 7 of that report there is a sworn statement of a seed-producing concern which gives the actual situation in respect to six successive crops in the valley to be benefited, ranging from 1914 to 1919. By this statement it is shown that of the six years five were abundantly successful, and the sixth year, 1919, by no means a failure. It would seem to any reasonable man that the farmer who can secure five successful crops out of six scarcely needs relief at the hands of the Federal Government, or, rather, at the expense of the people of the Nation, unless at the same time it is proposed to afford relief to the business man who after five successful years finds himself lacking a profit in the sixth.

There is reason to believe that the introduction of this measure is merely the entering wedge toward a wholesale exploitation of the water resources of the Yellowstone National Park. In fact, the engineer of the Fremont-Madison Reservoir Co., the applicant for this special privilege, has admitted that under the permission given by the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the possibilities in the Betcher Valley Basin, those investigations were pursued so that the ultimate design includes the use of the Yellowstone Lake as an irrigation reservoir.

If such a diversion from the original purpose manifested by Congress in the act of March 1, 1872, is to occur, it ought to be a diversion by Congress, and not indirectly through the Secretary of the Interior or any other official.

Information has just reached me to the effect that the section of the Yellowstone National Park which is to be changed into a reservoir is the haunt of certain sadly diminished wild animals, which, of course, will perish if the design to maintain Yellowstone National Park in its original primitive wildness is interfered with by those who feel that losing one crop in six is too much of a risk.

I venture to urge on behalf of a large and influential membership, including able men and women in every State in the Union, that you interpose every objection to the passage of this bill. I am informed that it is now on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, and may come up every Monday, with the opportunity to slip through the House, as a similar enactment has slipped through the Senate. At least such action should be taken as would force the proponents of this scheme to argue their case fairly and squarely before a committee of Congress, with an opportunity to come back on behalf of the public.

Very truly, yours,

ELEANOR E. MARSHALL, *Secretary.*

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, evidently Mr. Olmstead does not know much about—

Mr. TINKHAM. That is the American Civic Association.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Oh, yes; I know about this organization; but they do not know very much about farming in irrigated countries. If an irrigation farmer loses a crop once in six years, he is practically forced into bankruptcy, because he has had to spend so much money to keep up the water systems and pay the water-right assessments, maintenance fees, and so forth; and if he does not have a crop every year he is conducting a losing proposition, whereas in the eastern country, where you do not depend upon irrigation, you do not have to incur so much expense to maintain your land and to put in your crop, and as a result you can afford to lose a crop once in three years or four years and not be particularly harmed.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, is there objection?

Mr. TINKHAM. I object.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill remain on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 10917) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States" by adding thereto an additional section.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That an act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States," approved June 30, 1906, be amended by adding an additional section to said act, which section shall be designated section 12 and shall read as follows:

"SEC. 12. That said corporation may provide, by amendment to its by-laws, that the powers of the active members exercised at the annual meeting in the election of officers and the transaction of business shall be vested in and exercised by a representative assembly composed of delegates apportioned, elected, and governed in accordance with the provisions of the by-laws adopted by said corporation."

The SPEAKER. Is there—

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, is this bill for the National Education Association?

The SPEAKER. It is.

Mr. BEE. Reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. Consent has already been given. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. FESS. Would the gentleman like to discuss the bill?

Mr. BEE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Iowa some questions about it. I want to say very frankly to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], because I believe he knows it, that my interest in matters of education has been a very large one always. I have discussed the matter with the gentleman from Iowa upon other occasions. I am not familiar with the provisions of this particular act; but is the effect of this law to concentrate in the Federal Government eventually—not, perhaps, by the provisions of the law itself—control and supervision of the education in this country? In other words, not talking now about the rights of the States—but education has been getting along very well with the States—what good is to be accomplished by this association in the cause of education that will not impinge or infringe upon the control of education by the States themselves? I am not familiar with the provisions, and I am asking the gentleman from Iowa for information.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, this bill has nothing to do with the proposition that the gentleman is asking about. The National Education Association is a voluntary association of the educators of the United States. The association was founded in 1857. It at first received a charter from the District of Columbia and later received a charter from Congress. According to the provisions of that charter the officers are to be elected and the business of the corporation transacted by the active members of the association. Now, the association has grown to

be between 40,000 and 50,000 in active membership, so that it is impracticable to have a meeting of the active members. This bill provides that this association can amend its by-laws so as to have a representative meeting. In other words, it changes the form from a general democracy to a representative assembly. That is all that there is in the bill.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes.

Mr. BEE. Has this association heretofore been incorporated?

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, yes.

Mr. BEE. It is now incorporated?

Mr. TOWNER. Yes. It was first incorporated by the District of Columbia and afterwards by an act of Congress in 1906.

Mr. BEE. It is an association of educators, and the only object of this bill would be to give them the authority to amend their by-laws so as to provide for a representative meeting instead of a meeting of all the active members?

Mr. TOWNER. That is exactly it.

Mr. BEE. And it does not contemplate interference and has no power, of course, according to the gentleman's statement, of interference or reaching out and seeking control of the education in the United States?

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, no; I will say it has no such power.

Mr. BEE. And no such authority?

Mr. TOWNER. No.

Mr. CANNON. What function does it perform?

Mr. TOWNER. It is a voluntary association of the teachers and educators of the United States in the colleges and county and State superintendents and teachers of the United States. It has been in operation since 1857.

Mr. CANNON. But what does it do?

Mr. TOWNER. It has its annual meetings and it publishes its proceedings. Its proceedings are sent all over the world, I will say to the gentleman, and form perhaps a body of educational discussion as valuable as anything else that we have in that line.

Mr. CANNON. Who pays the expenses?

Mr. TOWNER. They do themselves. They have their dues, just the same as any other voluntary association.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. The association is made up of two classes, active membership and associate membership. The active membership fee annually is more than the associate membership fee, but with the membership fee as the only source of revenue, some years ago this association had over \$100,000 in its treasury, so that it is not a matter that depends upon any outside support to assist it financially.

The only object, I will say to my friend from Illinois, is, as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER], an annual meeting in the summer of the entire membership, or at least it is open to the entire membership, and a second meeting in the spring, usually in February, of those identified with the superintendents, known as the superintendents' section, and of these two meetings all of the proceedings, including all of the addresses, are printed in an annual report.

I want to supplement what the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] has said, that these reports, extending back before the Civil War, form the most expert body of information on educational democracy that is extant anywhere to-day in the world, and the association is not dependent upon benefits in the form of contributions from either State, county, or Federal governments, but it is a matter purely dependent upon its own membership.

Mr. CANNON. Is it an organization for propaganda and controlling legislation or asking legislation, or is it a grand powwow and a banquet?

Mr. FESS. I have never known it to have the grand powwow or the banquet, and I have never known it to be offensive in legislative matters.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BEE. In answer to the question of propaganda, I suppose that there is hardly any organization at this day and time that does not indulge in propaganda. As to the grand powwow, I will say to the gentleman from Illinois that a great deal of interest in these grand banquets has been removed by a recent amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. FESS. I am not interested in the banquet or the powwow, but I have had some correspondence from some of the officers now and then about some proposed legislation. I think that my friend from Illinois is not more offended than I am at unnecessary propaganda, and I believe that the National Education Association is pretty free from that charge. So far as I know it is as much so as the chamber of commerce.

Mr. CANNON. I am very glad to hear it.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. TOWNER, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE BAYOU BARTHOLOMEW, ARK.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12956) extending the time for constructing a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew, in the State of Arkansas.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress approved January 15, 1914, to be built across the Bayou Bartholomew, in the State of Arkansas, by Ashley County, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of the approval hereof.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ESCH, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MILITARY RESERVATION OF FORT LOGAN H. ROOTS, ARK.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13274) to convey to the Big Rock Stone & Construction Co. a portion of the military reservation of Fort Logan H. Roots, in the State of Arkansas.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, upon the payment by the Big Rock Stone & Construction Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Arkansas, of such sum as he may determine to be the reasonable value of the premises (but not less than \$150 per acre), to convey to the said company the following-described portion of the military reservation of Fort Logan H. Roots, near the city of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, to wit:

Beginning at the southeast corner of a 2-acre tract purchased from the United States by the Big Rock Stone & Construction Co., approved by act of Congress August 14, 1912; thence north 1° 18' east 437 feet to the southeast corner of an 18.75-acre tract purchased from the United States by the Big Rock Stone & Construction Co., approved by act of Congress August 14, 1912; thence south 54° 30' west along boundary line 250 feet to the southwest corner of said 18.75-acre tract, this point being also the northeast corner of the 2-acre tract above mentioned; thence south 33° 34' east 350 feet along boundary of said 2-acre tract to point of beginning, same being a triangular parcel of ground located in the southwest quarter of section 28, township 2 north, range 12 west, containing 1 acre.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to enter into a revocable lease with the Big Rock Stone & Construction Co., a corporation as aforesaid, on the following-described portion of the military reservation of Fort Logan H. Roots, near the city of Little Rock, State of Arkansas, to wit:

From cut-stone monument in boundary line of military reservation of Fort Logan H. Roots, approximately 150 feet southeast of brick pumping station, run north 37° 52' west 624 feet from point of beginning; thence south 54° 30' west approximately 240 feet to bank of Arkansas River; thence in a northerly direction, following up the left bank of river, approximately 1,300 feet to boundary line of a 2-acre tract purchased from the United States by the Big Rock Stone & Construction Co., approved by act of Congress August 14, 1912; thence north 54° 30' east along boundary line of said 2-acre tract to the southeast corner of said tract; thence south 33° 34' east alongside of bluff 1,300 feet to point of beginning, same being a strip of ground lying along the east bank of Arkansas River in the southwest quarter of section 28, township 2 north, range 12 west, containing 7.21 acres, at a rental value to be determined by the War Department.

Sec. 3. That this act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage and approval.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. JACOWAY, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOWAY. Mr. Speaker, this bill authorizes the Secretary of War to convey to the Big Rock Stone & Construction Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Arkansas, a portion of the military reservation at Fort Logan H. Roots, in the State of Arkansas. This company has numerous large contracts with the road commissioners of many of the special road districts of Arkansas for furnishing crushed stone for road-building purposes. In support of this bill I desire to read a letter from Hon. William B. Owen, commissioner of State lands, highways, and improvements, as follows:

The Big Rock Stone & Construction Co., of this city, have contracts for several hundred thousand tons of stone for good roads which are building and are to be built in this State. We know that there has been a great shortage of cars for shipment, and they have explained to us that if they could secure a certain tract of land along the base of the Fort Logan H. Roots Reservation, paralleling the spur track which leads into their plant, that this would enable them to store a large quantity of stone during the time that cars were not furnished. If you can secure the tract of land for them, I feel that it will be of inestimable value to the State in facilitating the increased storage and delivery of stone to the road districts of the State.

It is the intention of this company to use this land for storage purposes. They will run their crusher steadily and place the crushed stone on this space, so that when cars are received they can be loaded promptly and shipped. The passage of this bill will therefore greatly facilitate the road-building work throughout the State of Arkansas. This bill has the approval of the War Department.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

LESSEES AT CAMP FUNSTON, KANS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 3706) authorizing the Secretary of War to make settlement with the lessees who erected buildings on a five-year lease on the zone at Camp Funston, Kans., and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object for the present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York reserves the right to object.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, this bill, which has passed the Senate, is to authorize the Secretary of War to settle with the lessees who erected buildings on a five-year lease on the zone at Camp Funston, Kans.

These people erected buildings on a Government reservation for the purpose of supplying amusements and merchandise to the soldiers in that camp. They also contributed toward the construction of certain utilities in the camp. They paid to the Government 10 per cent of their gross receipts, which went into the fund for camp activities, and after three years had elapsed of their five-year lease, which provided that the Government should have the right to cancel the lease whenever it needed the land for military purposes or upon any military exigency, the Government ordered these men out of their property.

It occurred to the committee which considered the bill that the claimants had an equity, and we felt that it would be adjusted more quickly and to the best interests of the Government by conferring power upon the Secretary of War to make a proper adjudication of these claims, if upon investigation it was found that they had an equity, and that is the shape in which the bill is reported to the House.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield two minutes to me?

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been considered for some time by the Committee on War Claims. I feel that perhaps there are some of these men at Camp Funston who have a legitimate claim against the Government. In our deliberations we thought that if anything was done, it should be confined entirely to the people who sustained an actual loss on account of the Government having taken away their buildings and that perhaps the best way would be to let the people who had actually sustained the loss present their claim to the Court of Claims.

When the proposition was first brought to the attention of the War Claims Committee it was understood that there were only three different parties who had sustained actual loss, but later on, as the testimony was received, we found that there were several who thought perhaps they had sustained a loss.

I think that first we ought to find out the total amount of the claims made against the Government before any legislation is proposed, and I should like to ask the gentleman from Kansas if he knows anything about the total amount of these claims.

Mr. ANTHONY. I do not. I have never seen any figures, and I do not believe they have been put in concrete shape.

Mr. SNELL. The original statement made before the committee was that perhaps they would not exceed more than \$150,000. Then afterwards there were several others that they did not know about.

Now, it seems to me this is opening up an entirely new field. These people had a definite contract with the Government. Of course, as everyone knows, when a man went there as a concessionaire he went there for the purpose of making money, at least the majority of them did. If the war had lasted longer, of course they would have made more money; but it turned out that there were three or four or perhaps more who did not. I think it is a matter that should be considered very carefully and all the safeguards possible put around it; but I am not opposed to the people receiving the pay who have sustained actual losses from the fact that the Government took the property away from them.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNELL. I yield.

Mr. ANTHONY. Some of the gentlemen who are interested in these claims have suggested the propriety of amending this bill by authorizing the claimants to go to the Court of Claims, the court to find only for those who sustained losses in their business enterprises there. Does not the gentleman think that would open up a rather dangerous precedent, to promote the idea that the Government ought to recoup people who sustained losses?

Mr. SNELL. It would not seem like that to me. It seems to me only a plain proposition. There is no legal obligation, as far as the Government is concerned, but, on the other hand, perhaps there may be some moral obligation from the fact that the Government has taken away buildings which they have built there and they have not had an opportunity to carry on their business long enough to get back the original cost. That may be the foundation for some moral obligation, but, of course, that is rather an uncertain proposition, and for this reason I think we should be pretty careful about any general and far-reaching powers we give anyone for settling these claims. We certainly can not be too careful in these matters.

Mr. ANTHONY. If the gentleman will yield again, I will say that it occurred to some members of our committee who considered the bill that it would be better to confine the questions involved simply to those involved in the adjudication of the contract itself and of any equity that might lie in their claim, rather than to go into the question of those who had sustained loss, because that would open up a dangerous line of precedents and might involve the Government in considerable expense; and if these people have no valid or legal claim, the law officers of the War Department would certainly protect the interests of the Government.

Mr. SNELL. The Government complied absolutely with the contract that it made with each one of these people, and those who appeared before our committee did not claim that there was any legal obligation on the part of the Government.

Mr. ANTHONY. But would not the gentleman take the position that if the Government had complied with all the requirements of the contract no claim exists, and that the Secretary would so find?

Mr. SNELL. I would not want to take that position after the Secretary of War has said that he thinks they ought to be paid something.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. As I understand the situation it is this, that if we assume the position taken by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] we then enter into the field of speculation, because there is no way to tell what they would have made if the war had continued, and they were not entitled to anything except such as they would earn in the occupancy of their building; and Gen. Wood, in his testimony, states positively and definitely that there was no representation made as to the continued use of the camp for other purposes than for the preparation of men for war.

Mr. SNELL. I would like to offer this amendment for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 3 and 4, page 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "that jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine and render judgment for the amount it shall find and determine to be the net loss."

Strike out the period in line 2, page 2, and insert a colon, and add the following: "Provided, The claimant shall file his petition within one year after the approval of this act. In arriving at its findings the said court shall allow no profit to any claimant, nor shall the claimant be allowed interest in excess of 5 per cent per annum. The right of appeal is hereby granted to the claimant from judgment rendered by the Court of Claims."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, it has been suggested that the bill be passed without prejudice until next Monday, and in the

meantime the several gentlemen who have studied the matter may come to some agreement about the proper procedure.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 9932) a bill authorizing the Federal Trade Commission to accept and administer for the benefit of the public and the encouragement of industry inventions, patents, and patent rights, and for other purposes.

Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this bill be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that this bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER NEAR KANSAS CITY, MO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12891) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River near Kansas City.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that on April 17 the House passed the bill S. 4073, identical with this bill, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be stricken from the calendar and laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that this bill be laid on the table. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TO ESTABLISH A WOMEN'S BUREAU.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13229) to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the women's bureau.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MERRITT. I reserve the right to object.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this bill simply establishes under permanent law what has been carried on in the Department of Labor for more than two years. As it is, it leaves appropriations for it subject to a point of order by any Member of the House, and it is a very unsatisfactory way to carry on an activity of the Government.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I find on lines 8 and 9, page 1 of the bill, the words "it shall be the duty of said bureau to formulate standards and policies." What is meant by those words?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The general acceptance of the words as used so far as the activities of that bureau of the Government will be concerned.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If they are as broad as that, they must embrace so many things that the gentleman from Kansas would be able to state some of them.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. They refer to standards—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Standards of what—wages?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; standards of utilities and standards for the conduct of laborers, as they are now maintained in the department for both women and men.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is certainly general enough.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; it should be general. All of the activities of this department are now being carried on and have been ever since 1918. The activities of women in industry are greater now than they were then. There are more women engaged in industry in the country than there were the first year of the war.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I have no objection whatever to the idea involved in the bill, but inasmuch as they are given some duty and some power and authority I would like to know just what power and duty and authority the bill does permit.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. They are the duties that are usually exercised in a matter of that kind. The duties that the Labor Bureau exercises with respect to men in industry we are prescribing for the bureau for women in industry.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I did not know that the Bureau of Labor prescribed any kind of a standard. What kind of a standard does it prescribe—how much work a man must do or the hours he must work and under what conditions?

Mr. MERRITT. How little he must do.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. That is not the intention of it. The standard for women, for instance, who work in a store—whether women shall stand up or sit down when off duty. That is a matter that comes within the scope of this bureau.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Would this bureau have authority to make regulations in respect to the matter the gentleman is speaking of and enforce them?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. No; not to enforce them, but to suggest them, as it is doing to-day. A committee of women came to Congress some years ago and suggested that the women clerks in Washington were not permitted to sit down from the time they entered the store until they left it. A committee of Congress brought in a bill requiring merchants in this city to put in stools to permit their clerks to sit down when they were not engaged in work. That is one of the things that would come within the scope of this bureau.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That was a proper piece of legislation.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. It is for the purpose of suggesting such things as that that this bureau will have to do. They have no power to say to an industry you shall do this or you shall do that; they simply have the same power to make suggestions that the Bureau of Labor has with respect to the employment of men. The women entering industry in this country bring in new features, and there is no man who knows anything at all about the employment of women but knows that there should be different standards with respect to the utilities, the conveniences, the rest places that are provided by the employers in this industry for women.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, having listened to the gentleman's very lucid explanation, I have no objection whatever to the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. The reason I think this bill is objectionable is that it makes into permanent law a war-time expedient. I think before we do that we ought to let the war get by, we ought to let this presidential year get by, and consider the Department of Labor and all other departments, with the idea of consolidating their activities and, if possible, economizing and making more efficient their operation.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MERRITT. I yield for a question.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. So far as economy is concerned, we shall not spend any more money in this matter than we are spending to-day and, probably, will not spend so much.

Mr. MERRITT. We do not want to spend as much. Mr. Speaker, I think the women who have given this matter most attention believe that when women get all of their rights, as they have so many of them now—the same rights that men have—we ought not to differentiate as between men and women. Of course, in many respects, as the gentleman has pointed out, women must be treated differently from men, but I think to have a man's department and a woman's department in the Department of Labor is entirely wrong. I hope certainly that at all times there will be a certain number of women in that department, but I do not believe that now is the time to fasten onto that department a war-time expedient. Therefore at the proper time I shall object.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I trust the gentleman will not object. We are carrying in the current sundry civil appropriation act an appropriation of \$40,000 for the character of work which would be carried on under this bill. I think there is no doubt but that the Committee on Appropriations will make an appropriation for this work in the sundry civil appropriation bill, to be reported in a few days. I am rather inclined to think, if asked to do it, the Committee on Rules would be disposed to grant a rule to make that appropriation in order. The bill before us puts in proper legislative form, and in a very conservative legislative form, the direction of this work which is now being carried on without specific authority of law. I have no doubt but that it will be carried on—at least I hope it will—and I think it would be better to carry it on under conservative, constructive, specific legislation rather than as we are carrying it on now.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this is not a constructive or conservative way to make this into permanent law, and therefore I object.

BRIDGE ACROSS ST. LOUIS RIVER, MINN. AND WIS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13387) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNELL). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the time for completing the construction of a bridge, authorized by act of Congress, approved August 7, 1916, to be built across the St. Louis River at a point suitable to the interests of navigation between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, from the village of Fond du Lac, a suburb of Duluth, Minn., to a point on the Wisconsin shore about 100 feet westerly from the mouth of Dubrey Creek, is hereby extended one year from the date of approval hereof.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "Dubrey" and insert in lieu thereof "Dubray."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CARSS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER, OKLA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13253) to grant the consent of Congress to the Elmer Red River Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Red River.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Elmer Red River Bridge Co., to be composed of the following members, namely: B. F. Flowers and C. H. Harp, of Elmer, Jackson County, Okla., and W. T. Gibbons, of Odell, Wilbarger County, Tex., and their successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Red River at a point near the southeast corner of section 24, township 1 south, range 21 west of Indian meridian, Jackson County, Okla., to a point south in Wilbarger County, Tex.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, after the word "point" insert the words "suitable to the interests of navigation."

Page 2, line 2, after the word "Texas" insert "in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled 'An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters,' approved March 23, 1906."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. McCLINTIC, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PILGRIM TERCENTENARY CELEBRATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was House joint resolution 302, authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown and Plymouth, Mass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how much appropriation does this carry?

Mr. LUCE. It carries \$400,000, \$300,000 for Plymouth and \$100,000 for Provincetown, as recommended by the special committee of the House and Senate and further recommended by the Committee on the Library.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in the interest of economy, I am compelled to object.

Mr. LUCE. Will the gentleman reserve his objection for a moment?

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is on the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is true, but it is considered automatically in the House as in the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, we ought to have this resolution reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman reserve the right to object?

Mr. McKEOWN. I reserve the right to object for the purpose of having the resolution reported.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the joint resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 302) authorizing an appropriation for the participation of the United States in the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown and Plymouth, Mass.

Whereas on December 21 next will occur the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown and Plymouth, Mass.; and

Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the town of Plymouth have appointed a commission and a special committee to arrange plans for a proper and fitting observance of this historic anniversary; and

Whereas the plans contemplate the improvement and restoration of Plymouth Rock and the shore line where such landing was made, the improvement and protection of the burial grounds on Coles Hill and Burial Hill in Plymouth, where are buried the remains of those who succumbed to the rigors of the first winter and of those who died later, respectively, the erection of a memorial building, the placing of tablets at certain historic spots in the old Colony, and the undertaking of certain other improvements; and

Whereas the plans further contemplate the holding of certain appropriate exercises in December of the current year and also during the summer of 1921, for all of which matters there have been appropriated the sums of \$275,000 by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and \$320,000 by the town of Plymouth, and in addition thereto assurances have been given that the expense of certain features of the celebration will be borne in whole or in part by certain patriotic or fraternal societies or organizations; and

Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has further created by legislation a commission to prepare plans for the participation in the celebration by the town of Provincetown, on Cope Cod, in the harbor of which the *Mayflower* first came to anchor, and has appropriated \$50,000 to carry out the plans adopted by the commission; and

Whereas it is contemplated making certain improvements adjacent to the Pilgrim Monument in Provincetown, which was erected several years ago, the cost thereof having been borne from funds provided by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, by the Congress, by the town of Provincetown, and by contributions of individuals, and it is now desired to provide a dignified and safe approach to the monument, to erect tablets or markers at certain points in Provincetown and the adjacent towns of Truro, Wellfleet, and Eastham, on Cape Cod, commemorating certain events associated with the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown, and to hold appropriate exercises in connection therewith and in conjunction with the observance of the landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth and the establishment of their Colony there; and

Whereas a joint special committee of this Congress has considered the matter of the participation of the United States in the observance of this historic tercentenary and has filed its report and recommendations: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the United States Pilgrim Tercentenary Commission (hereinafter referred to as the commission) and to be composed of nine commissioners, as follows: Three persons to be appointed by the President of the United States, two Senators by the President of the Senate, and four Representatives by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The commissioners shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. (a) That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated the sum of \$400,000, to be expended by the commission in accordance with the provisions of this resolution.

(b) One hundred thousand dollars of such appropriation may be expended under the direction of the commission and in cooperation with the Provincetown Tercentenary Commission, the town of Provincetown, Mass., and such other agencies, public or private, as the commission may determine, for the purpose of completing and improving the approaches to and the grounds of the Pilgrim Monument at Provincetown, Mass.; of erecting suitably inscribed tablets or markers in the towns of Provincetown, Truro, Wellfleet, and Eastham, and for other work in connection therewith, in accordance with plans adopted by the Provincetown Tercentenary Commission.

(c) Three hundred thousand dollars of such appropriation may be expended under the direction of the commission and in cooperation with the Pilgrim Tercentenary Commission, the town of Plymouth, Mass., and such other agencies, public or private, as the commission may determine, for the purpose of restoring and improving Plymouth Rock and the shore line of the locality adjacent thereto, of protecting and improving the burial grounds upon Coles Hill and Burial Hill in Plymouth, Mass.; of erecting tablets or markers at appropriate places in the Old Colony, and for other work in connection therewith, in accordance with plans adopted by the Pilgrim Tercentenary Commission.

SEC. 3. That no expenditure shall be made or authorized by the commission until the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has, as determined by the commission, expended or contracted to expend the sum of \$300,000 for the same purposes for which the commission may under the provisions of this resolution make expenditures. The United States shall not be held liable for any cost, expense, obligation, or indebtedness on account of the maintenance or upkeep of any property in respect to which any expenditure is made by the commission under the provisions of this resolution, nor for any obligation or indebtedness incurred by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the Provincetown Tercentenary Commission, the Pilgrim Tercentenary Commission, or any other agency or officer, employee, or agent thereof, for any purpose for which the commission may under the provisions of this resolution make expenditures. All expenditures of the commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the chairman of the commission, but no expenditure shall be made or authorized by the commission except with the approval of a majority of the commissioners.

SEC. 4. That the Postmaster General is hereby authorized and directed to issue a special series of postage stamps, in such denominations and of such design as he may determine, commemorative of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims at Provincetown and Plymouth, Mass.

SEC. 5. That the provisions of sections 1 and 2 of this resolution shall expire December 31, 1921.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 7, strike out the word "two" and insert the word "four."

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, inasmuch as this carries such a large appropriation, I think we ought to have some explanation of the resolution.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, it is a fortunate coincidence that this resolution comes before the House upon the 19th day of April, which in our State is celebrated as Patriots Day. Some years ago we joined two holidays, forming Patriots Days, out of the celebration of the Battles of Lexington and Concord, and out of Fast Day, a day that for more than 200 years had been a day of fasting provided by our Puritan forefathers as one of the two great holidays which they gave to this country, the other being Thanksgiving Day.

So it is not inappropriate that the House, if it sees fit, should to-day decide to share, not alone with Massachusetts, but, indeed, with all the English-speaking world, in the commemoration of the landing of the Pilgrims. The three hundredth anniversary of this epoch-making occurrence will come in December, a time of year when only indoor exercises will be possible. The main celebration is to follow in the succeeding summer. The commission appointed by the Commonwealth to determine what sort of a celebration would be most fitting, reached the conclusion that it would not advise an exposition or anything costly in the way of a temporary and passing observance of the day. It seemed to them more in harmony with the purposes of the commemoration, the solemn purposes, that we should show our recollection of this episode out of which sprang so much of our history, by some permanent memorial. The special committee appointed by the House and Senate, which visited the spot last year, agreed with the Massachusetts commission that this was the form that the commemoration should take, and the Committee on the Library, for whom I am speaking, also accepted that view. The result, therefore, of these three separate studies of the problem is an agreement that there shall be a permanent expenditure at Plymouth and at Provincetown. To take the matter chronologically—

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. Certainly.

Mr. McKEOWN. As I understand this bill it carries \$300,000 for Plymouth and \$100,000 for Provincetown. Now, how much money does the Commonwealth of Massachusetts appropriate for that purpose?

Mr. LUCE. I was about to explain that at Provincetown, where a stately monument has been erected in part by the help of the Government, the State will expend \$50,000, and if this bill prevails the Nation will expend \$100,000 in furnishing suitable approaches to the monument. It is now almost inaccessible for vehicles and its surroundings are undignified and unworthy the monument itself.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. I will.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Is this money to be used in buying up property around the monument?

Mr. LUCE. Only so far, I understand, as the approach may be cut through a parcel of land leading up the hill to the monument; but there is only a very small taking of property.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Is the larger part of this money to be spent in the buying up of property around there?

Mr. LUCE. Only a small part, I understand. The chief expenditure at Provincetown is the grading of the hill and the erecting of some sort of an approach, such as is found here at the Washington Monument.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Provincetown is going to get \$100,000 out of this appropriation?

Mr. LUCE. Yes; and \$50,000 from the State.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Does not Provincetown think it can get along with about half of that amount if we could not give the whole amount?

Mr. LUCE. On the contrary, they have urgently pleaded with the Massachusetts Members asking them to secure more. They do not think they can do the work adequately; but in the judgment of the commission which visited the spot, the Senators and Representatives who went there and with their eyes saw what ought to be done, this would be a reasonable amount to appropriate.

Mr. HARDY of Colorado. Does the gentleman think, in view of the financial condition of the country at this time, with the many necessary things demanded from other sources, considering the large bonus bill we are going to vote out in a week or two, that we should appropriate \$400,000 for a monument right now?

Mr. LUCE. That phase of the question received the most earnest consideration from your committee. The only answer to it is that the tercentennial observance of a great historical

happening is a matter that can no more be postponed than could be postponed the World's Fair at Chicago, which, the gentleman will recollect, came in the very middle of the disastrous panic of 1893. Time and tide wait for no man. A celebration of this sort can not be materially delayed. Therefore it seemed to your committees, both the special committee and the Committee on the Library, that action now is justifiable. However, with precisely the point in mind to which the gentleman has brought attention, they recommended an appropriation less than one-sixth of what the Government spent for the celebration of the settlement of Jamestown. At that time there was an expenditure by the Federal Government of \$2,650,000 to commemorate the landing and settlement of the Cavaliers. We ask but \$100,000 to commemorate the landing and settlement of the Puritans. At the St. Louis Exposition there was an expenditure by the Government of \$11,000,000 and more, something like twenty-five times as much as is here contemplated. In view of present conditions, we felt we would not be justified in asking anything like—I do not think it ought to be called the generosity, but anything like the liberality of Congress on those previous occasions of kindred nature. It was thought if we could in a general way match what was being expended locally it would be a fitting and justifiable procedure.

Mr. WELLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUCE. I will.

Mr. WELLING. If this money is appropriated, will the monument be erected by the date of the centennial exposition?

Mr. LUCE. Permit me to say that the monument at Provincetown is already erected.

Mr. WELLING. I mean the monument provided for in the bill?

Mr. LUCE. No monument is provided for in the bill itself.

Mr. WELLING. The bill has reference to certain markers—

Mr. LUCE. Those markers are very simple and can be very easily provided. They are simply tablets such as historical societies have placed in so many places. The money at Plymouth is to be almost wholly expended on Plymouth Rock itself and its surroundings.

Mr. WELLING. And the bay?

Mr. LUCE. And the bay.

Mr. WELLING. Will that money be expended by the date of the centennial or go over for another year or two afterwards?

Mr. LUCE. The hope is that it will be expended on these approaches and surroundings by the time of the general celebration which comes in the summer of the year 1921. The celebration in December, 1920, must take place indoors. Whether the outdoor work can be completed this summer or not, I would not undertake to guarantee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I renew my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Mississippi objects. The Clerk will report the next bill on the calendar.

YANKTON AGENCY PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 2442) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the trustees of the Yankton Agency Presbyterian Church, by patent in fee, certain land within the Yankton Indian Reservation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to convey to the trustees of the Yankton Agency Presbyterian Church, by patent in fee, the following-described premises situate within the Yankton Indian Reservation, county of Charles Mix, State of South Dakota: Beginning at the northwest corner of lot 9, section 27, township 94 north, range 64 west of fifth principal meridian; thence south 25° 4', west five and fifty-hundredths chains to the southwest corner of lot 2, section 34; thence north 64° 56', west one and forty-hundredths chains, more or less, to the east boundary of the Presbyterian Church and school reserve; thence north 25° 4', east five and fifty-hundredths chains, more or less, along the east boundary of the said Presbyterian Church and school reserve to the northeast corner thereof; thence south 64° 56', east one and fifty-hundredths chains, more or less, to the place of beginning; containing seventy-seven hundredths acres, more or less; for the uses of said church upon the payment by said trustees to the Secretary of the Interior of the sum of \$75, the value of said premises as heretofore found by due appraisal thereof.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the title of the bill H. R. 5163 be amended to correspond with the text.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent to change the title of H. R. 5163 to correspond with the text. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the next bill on the calendar.

COAST GUARD STATION, COOK COUNTY, MINN.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 9228) to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Lake Superior, in Cook County, Minn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CANNON. Let the bill be read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the bill for information.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to establish a Coast Guard station on the coast of Lake Superior, in Cook County, Minn., in such locality as the captain commandant of the Coast Guard may recommend.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. I do not know whether I shall object or not. I would like to know something about it. Who stands for the bill?

Mr. CARSS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, this Coast Guard station that is recommended to be established by this bill will protect about 200 miles of rocky coast on the north shore of Lake Superior. From the Canadian line to the port of Duluth there is absolutely no protection to commerce, and a good many accidents have occurred there, many fishermen having been driven out to sea and lost; in some cases were lost in full sight of their families and friends, who were powerless to render aid. The captain commandant of the Coast Guard recommends that this station be established at a place called Grand Marais, where there is a safe harbor, and there they have wireless radio and telephone connection and a lighthouse. The committee reported the bill unanimously, and the captain commandant of the Coast Guard recommended that in the interest of humanity and for the protection of navigation this bill for the establishment of this Coast Guard station be passed.

Mr. CANNON. What is to be the cost of it?

Mr. CARSS. About \$60,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, this bill is on the Union Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that the Chair ruled several weeks ago that as to bills on the Unanimous Consent Calendar, when unanimous consent was given to their consideration, could be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. The Clerk will read the bill.

The bill was again read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. CARSS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

FORT DOUGLAS MILITARY RESERVATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was House joint resolution 301, to authorize the Secretary of War to grant revocable licenses for the removal of sand and gravel from the Fort Douglas Military Reservation for industrial purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask that the resolution be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to grant revocable licenses for the removal of sand and gravel from the Fort Douglas Military Reservation, Utah, to persons and corporations within said State, to be used for industrial and manufacturing purposes.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Committee amendment: Page 1, line 7, after the word "purposes," insert "at such reasonable prices as may be fixed by the Secretary of War."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARRETT. May I ask the gentleman in charge of the bill why it is necessary to have an act of Congress? Does not the power now exist in the War Department?

Mr. OLNEY. In the absence of Mr. MAYS, who had this bill directly in charge, I will submit a letter in support of this measure from the Secretary of War. He says:

WAR DEPARTMENT, March 25, 1920.

To the CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives.

SIR: With reference to your letter of March 20, 1920, requesting a report on House joint resolution 301, which authorizes the Secretary of War to grant revocable licenses for the removal of sand and gravel from the Fort Douglas Military Reservation for industrial purposes, I have the honor to advise you that the War Department recommends the passage of this resolution.

It has been ascertained that the removal of this sand will not be harmful to the reservation and that the Government will receive remuneration for the same.

Respectfully, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Mr. GARRETT. I will say that I have no objection to the bill. I wish to inquire, though, in regard to the legal situation.

Mr. OLNEY. I think probably a resolution of this kind is necessary, as it involves an expenditure of money, or perhaps rather a financial transaction—that is, the purchase of sand and gravel by residents near this reservation who would pay reasonable prices for sand and gravel obtained on the reservation.

Mr. GARRETT. I had occasion recently to make an inquiry about a matter of taking sand and gravel from a navigable stream, and I learned that the department now had authority, without any act of Congress, to permit that in so far as the Government's interest was concerned. Of course, they would have to arrange with the riparian owners about the rights to it. I wondered if we did not have a general law to cover military reservations. I assume, however, that this is necessary, or else it would not be offered.

Mr. McKEOWN. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is anticipated that persons may take this sand and gravel and speculate on it, instead of using it for their own buildings?

Mr. OLNEY. No. It is absolutely under the discretion of the War Department, who would protect both Government and the public, and the price is to be fixed within reason.

Mr. McKEOWN. I withdraw the reservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The resolution was again reported.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. OLNEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next bill.

COMMUTATION OF HOMESTEAD ENTRIES BY WORLD WAR VETERANS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 13592) to authorize certain homestead settlers or entrymen who entered the military or naval service of the United States during the war with Germany to commute their entries.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. McKEOWN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, what is the necessity for this bill?

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, the present law giving soldiers of the war with Germany a credit for the time that they served in the war compels them to live at least a year on the homestead. If they had served two years in the war they have to reside at least one year upon their homestead entries. Now, it has developed since the war that a number of soldiers were so severely wounded and incapacitated that they are unable to return to their homesteads.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. RAKER. This only applies to wounded and disabled soldiers?

Mr. SINNOTT. It only applies to wounded or disabled soldiers or sailors; those who were incapacitated during the war and are unable to return to their homesteads. It allows them to commute, and under the commutation laws one has to live 14 months on his homestead entry, less the absent period. This gives the incapacitated soldier an opportunity to purchase his homestead the same as a civilian may do to-day.

Mr. CANNON. How do you mean? He takes title without purchase, does he not?

Mr. SINNOTT. No; he takes title by paying \$1.25 an acre. That is a privilege given to the civilian homesteader to-day.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I notice in the State of Oregon to-day a large number of soldiers are applying now, having a preferential right. Do they have the right to commute?

Mr. SINNOTT. This bill relates only to those who were disabled or incapacitated during the war.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I wanted to know for information how the application was made. It seems soldiers have a preference right. They are going on the old California-Oregon line now.

Mr. SINNOTT. That is covered by a special act.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They have a right to pay for the land later at \$1.25?

Mr. SINNOTT. No. They pay \$2.50 an acre, because the Supreme Court has held that the railroad was entitled to \$2.50 an acre out of that grant.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. He gets the preferential right?

Mr. SINNOTT. I think perhaps he would get credit for the time he was in the service.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any settler or entryman under the homestead laws of the United States, who, after settlement, application, or entry and prior to November 11, 1918, enlisted or was actually engaged in the United States Army, Navy, or Marine Corps during the war with Germany, who has been honorably discharged and because of physical incapacities due to service is unable to return to the land may make proof, without further residence or cultivation, at such time and place as may be authorized by the Secretary of the Interior, and receive patent to the land by him so entered or settled upon by making payment for the land at the price fixed by law as in case of commutation: *Provided*, That no such patent shall issue prior to the survey of the land.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer an amendment to this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SNELL). The gentleman from South Dakota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. GANDY. In line 10, after the word "residence" insert the word "improvement," so that it shall read, "without further residence, improvement, or cultivation."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Dakota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GANDY: On page 1, line 10, after the word "residence" insert the word "improvement."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GANDY. On page 2, line 2, I move to amend by striking out all of line 2 down to the semicolon in line 3.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota offers another amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GANDY: Page 2, line 2, strike out all of line 2 and down to the semicolon in line 3—

Mr. CANNON. What are those lines?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

by making payment for the land at the price fixed by law as in case of commutation.

Mr. CANNON. I understood this was to affect the boys that were wounded and unable to go on the land. We are taking awfully good care of those boys now. It runs up into many hundreds of millions of dollars. This is to give them a homestead besides?

Mr. GANDY. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. GANDY. I want to say that my thought is that after having provided that there first should be a finding by the Secretary of the Interior that the man, because of his service in the war, is physically incapacitated from going on the land, he ought not to be required to pay for it; or, in other words, he ought not to start out on this land with a mortgage on it.

Mr. CANNON. If a man is physically incapacitated, if he is armless or legless or sightless or otherwise physically incapacitated, he is wonderfully cared for, with hospital treatment, and his dependents are cared for, and he gets his \$100 or \$120 a month, and so on. Now, the question in my mind is whether this be in point of fact in the interest of the men that I have described or whether the very moment it becomes a law they will be encouraged by speculators and agents, and so on, to pay them so much for their services.

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. This relates only to the soldiers who made their application for entry prior to November 11, 1918. It does not apply to soldiers returning from the war and thereafter making an entry.

Mr. CANNON. But it does apply, if they are not able to go on and get their \$120 a month? Would it be apt to cut out soldiers who are not disabled and who are not receiving this money? Would it be so extensive that it would prevent them from getting the homestead?

Mr. SINNOTT. The amendment of the gentleman from South Dakota would give the soldier the land without any further payment. That is the effect of the gentleman's amendment. I think it should be adopted.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It would have the same effect as if he introduced a provision that the soldier would not be required to live upon the land the balance of the residence period. It simply excuses him from residence and allows him to make final proof.

Mr. SINNOTT. It also excuses him from making the payment of \$1.25 an acre.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. If he went there and lived six months more on the land, he would get the land anyway.

Mr. SINNOTT. Not many of them have made application.

Mr. CANNON. I am anticipating that it will not be for the benefit of the soldier but for the speculator, you know, who never was in the war.

Mr. SINNOTT. It could not be taken advantage of by anyone else applying for the land.

Mr. CANNON. I understand that; but they can hunt up this man, if the land is valuable, and charge him so much for their services.

Mr. SINNOTT. He would have to be a soldier who made the homestead entry prior to going into the war, and then became so disabled that he could not return to the land.

Mr. CANNON. I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. SINNOTT, by unanimous consent, the title of the bill was amended to correspond with the text.

On motion of Mr. SINNOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the Yellowstone Park bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Yellowstone Park bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. WALSH] may extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Pilgrim memorial bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that his colleague [Mr. WALSH] may extend his remarks in the RECORD on the Pilgrim memorial bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CLAIMS OF INDIANS IN CALIFORNIA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 12788) authorizing any tribes or bands of Indians in California to submit claims to the Court of Claims.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. Let us have the bill read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all claims of whatsoever nature which any tribes or bands of Indians of California may have against the United States may be submitted to the Court of Claims for determination of the amount, if any, due said tribes or bands from the United States for lands formerly occupied and claimed by them in the said State, which lands are alleged to have been taken from them without compensation; and jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the Court of Claims, with the right of either party to appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, to hear and determine all legal and equitable claims, if any, of said tribes or bands against the United States, and to enter judgment thereon.

Sec. 2. That if any claim or claims be submitted to said court, they shall settle the rights therein, both legal and equitable, of each and all

the parties thereto, notwithstanding lapse of time or statutes of limitation, and any payment which may have been made upon any claim so submitted shall not be pleaded as an estoppel, but may be pleaded as an offset in such suits or actions, and the United States shall be allowed credit for all sums heretofore paid or expended for the benefit of said tribes or any band thereof. The claim or claims of the said tribe or any band thereof may be presented separately or jointly by petition, subject, however, to amendment, suit to be filed within five years after the passage of this act; and such action shall make the petitioner or petitioners party plaintiff or plaintiffs and the United States shall be the party defendant, and any band or bands of said tribes the court may deem necessary to a final determination of such suit or suits may be joined therein as the court may order. Such petition, which shall be verified by the attorney or attorneys employed by the aforesaid tribes or bands of Indians of California, shall set forth all the facts on which the claims for recovery are based, and said petition shall be signed by the attorney or attorneys employed, and no other verification shall be necessary; official letters, papers, documents, and public records, or certified copies thereof, may be used in evidence, and the departments of the Government shall give access to the attorney or attorneys of said tribes or bands thereof to such treaties, papers, correspondence, or records as may be needed by the attorney or attorneys for said tribes or bands of Indians.

Sec. 3. That upon the final determination of such suit, cause, or action, the Court of Claims shall decree such fees as it shall find reasonable to be paid the attorney or attorneys employed therein by said tribes, subject to approval by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and under contracts negotiated and approved as provided by existing law, and in no case shall the fees decreed by said court be more than 10 per cent of the amount of the judgment recovered by such cause, such fee to be paid from said judgment.

With the following committee amendments:

After the word "equitable," in line 6, page 2, insert the following phrase: "which shall be based upon the fair value of any such lands at the time the treaties were ratified by the several tribes or bands of Indians, not to exceed \$1.25 per acre."

After the word "thereof," in line 15, page 2, insert the words "including gratuities."

Line 18, page 2, strike out the word "five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "two."

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, this bill ought not to be considered with a handful of Members present, and therefore I object.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON. I yield; but I am going to object.

Mr. RAKER. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this morning already two bills on this calendar which are practically identical in form with this bill have passed the House—H. R. 5163 and S. 806.

Mr. CANNON. If those two ought not to have been passed, is that any reason why a third one should pass?

Mr. RAKER. They ought to have passed. This bill ought to pass, and I am satisfied that if the gentleman will permit me, I can call his attention to the extreme justice of it, and that he will not urge his objection.

This bill simply allows the Indians of California to present their claims to the Court of Claims to determine whether or not they have any rights against the Government; and it provides that all funds, gratuities, or otherwise that have already been paid them shall be charged up against the Indians and the Government given credit for such payments.

Full hearing was had on this bill by the committee when all the members of the committee were present. Representatives of the Department of the Interior and of the Indian Bureau were present, and I will say to the gentleman that the chairman of the committee said this seemed to be one of the clearest and plainest cases that had been presented since he had been chairman of the committee. It simply authorizes them to go into the courts and present their rights.

Mr. CANNON. What will happen then?

Mr. RAKER. Then, if they establish a valid right, the court may adjudicate what that is, deducting the amount already paid to the Indians by gratuities or otherwise.

Mr. CANNON. Yes. I call the gentleman's attention to section 3, which provides for the payment of the attorneys. We all understand about the attorneys in Washington, D. C., and we have a court that is already burdened, world without end. I object.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there again?

Mr. CANNON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RAKER. In the bill H. R. 1563 is this provision:

Provided, That in no case shall the fees decreed by said court amount to more than 10 per cent of the amount of the judgment recovered in such cause.

In the other bill, which passed this morning, S. 806, is this provision:

Provided, That in no case shall the fees and expenses decreed by said court be in excess of 10 per cent of the amount of the judgment.

That identical provision has been contained in all these bills in the past during this Congress.

Mr. CANNON. They would not have passed by unanimous consent with a handful of Members present if I had been in the House.

Mr. RAKER. The same gentlemen are here who were here when those bills passed, and I want to say to the gentleman this—

Mr. CANNON. Well, I object. I do not want to be discourteous. I will withhold the objection if the gentleman wants to talk further. The objection is not personal to him at all.

Mr. RAKER. I want to appeal to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois on this particular claim. There have been 10 or 12 bills reported out by the Committee on Indian Affairs that contain practically the same provision as this bill. This bill goes further than any of them in protecting the Government. In allowing credits to the Government for moneys advanced to the Indians it includes the words "gratuities," so that whatever the Government may have given these Indians it will get credit for and the Indians will be charged with the amounts which they have received.

Mr. CANNON. This reservation has been sold, has it not?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Disposed of?

Mr. RAKER. Long ago.

Mr. CANNON. Under legislation?

Mr. RAKER. No; that is the trouble.

Mr. CANNON. Then it is not disposed of unless it is disposed of legally.

Mr. RAKER. It has been sold and disposed of. I know the gentleman will listen to this and will not object when he hears the facts.

Mr. CANNON. All right. Go ahead.

Mr. RAKER. In 1851 and 1852 there were tribes of Indians in California who entered into 18 treaties with the authorized agents of the Federal Government. The Indians then claimed under the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo between the United States and Mexico great tracts of land in California, and under the Mexican law and under that treaty it was theirs as of right, just as you and I own our property to-day. The Government entered into these treaties and the Indians reduced their claims altogether to 7,500,000 acres.

The Government agreed to give them that land in reservations. It also agreed to give them \$1,500,000 in money. The Indians thought the Government would carry out its contract. They were to be faithful, were to abide by the law, were to assist the Government, which they did. Then the Federal Government went to work and took every acre of this land, and has sold it, and the Indians have not received 1 acre in return under these 18 treaties which they solemnly entered into with the Federal Government.

These Indians are now about 20,000 in number. All they ask is the opportunity to go into the Court of Claims and present their claims there to see whether or not they have any rights, whether or not the Federal Government took these 7,500,000 acres of theirs from them without just cause.

Mr. CANNON. There was a treaty with them?

Mr. RAKER. I had not quite finished. The Government took the land and the Indians got nothing.

Mr. CANNON. Then the Government has no right to take the land.

Mr. RAKER. But it took the land; the Indians are there and unprovided for. I appeal to the gentleman from Illinois to give these unfortunate Indians the permission to go into the Court of Claims and establish their rights.

Mr. CANNON. All this happened way back in 1852?

Mr. RAKER. Yes. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. CANNON. I will object, for I think this begets a lot of lawsuits for speculators to work up claims. It has all the earmarks of a bill for the benefit of speculators, and I do not think it ought to pass.

Mr. RAKER. It has no connection with speculators; it has to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. CANNON. That is an easy job.

Mr. RAKER. I hope the gentleman, under the circumstances, will not object. Two similar bills have passed to-day with the same Members of the House here present now. I want to say that the Indians of California have had poorer treatment than any other Indians in the United States.

Mr. CANNON. I want to understand the gentleman a little further. As I understand it, these Indians claim to own this land. The treaty was made with them in which they relinquished all their rights and the Government paid them as it agreed to.

Mr. RAKER. No; it did not. That is the trouble; the Government has not paid them a cent, but took over this land.

Mr. CANNON. Then the Indians have not parted with their title?

Mr. RAKER. The Government took it under the Mexican title. They claimed it all, and if they found an Indian that they did not like on the land they moved him off and sold it. These Indians were without any counsel, without any adviser, and without anybody to protect them. They have been pushed from pillar to post and thousands have starved to death for want of protection. The Department of the Interior has thoroughly investigated the case and says that the Indians deserve better treatment; they have had poorer treatment than any other Indians in the United States. Now, I think we ought to give them a chance to present their claims to the Court of Claims.

Mr. CANNON. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will look into the matter further. It looks to me like there was an African in the wood-pile. The Indians are all dead.

Mr. RAKER. No; there are 20,000 of them living.

Mr. CANNON. But they are the descendants of the original Indians.

Mr. RAKER. I know they are living, because I know where they live—all over the State of California.

Mr. CANNON. For the present, Mr. Speaker, I will object.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the bill retain its place on the calendar. Is there objection?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Reserving the right to object, how often has this request been made with respect to this bill?

Mr. RAKER. This is the first and only time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution (H. J. Res. 302) with reference to the observance of the three hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrims retain its place on the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RAILROAD DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. GOOD, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, by direction of that committee reported the bill (H. R. 13677) making appropriations to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for the Federal control of transportation systems and to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GARRETT reserved all points of order.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN HOMESTEAD ENTRYMEN.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 8690) for the relief of certain homestead entrymen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have some explanation of the bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, some time ago we passed some homestead laws providing that where a man has settled on less than 320 acres of what is known as arid, non-irrigable, dry-farming land, under the enlarged-homestead law, he may take an additional homestead entry of a sufficient amount of the same character of land, if he can find any vacant, to make up the 320 acres. There is a 20-mile provision in one law. In other words, Congress decided that every settler is entitled to 320 acres of arid, dry-farming land, and that that amount of that kind of land is necessary to make a living upon.

Mr. GANDY. If the gentleman will yield, I hope the gentleman does not want that statement to go into the Record. The permission is not limited to 20 miles; he may go to any place in the United States under the section law and get the additional land.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. There was a 20-mile provision as to residence in one act, as I recollect it. The same kind of provision—as to allowing an additional entry of a sufficient amount of land to make up 640 acres—was passed in regard to the 640-acre stock-raising homestead. The Congress passed a law that every settler on the public domain was entitled to 640 acres of dry, arid, nonirrigable grazing land for stock-raising purposes as a stock-raising homestead. Since that time we have passed laws providing that where a man had made a settlement upon that character of land, and did not have the

full 640 acres of such grazing, stock-raising ground, he might take additional entry of such an amount as was necessary to make up the 640 acres. But that did not and does not apply to people who are settled in any of the forest reserves. A good many people all over the West took some dry pieces of land within the forest reserves to try to make a living. Some took 40, some 80, and some 160 acres. They could not, and can not now, take more than 160 acres in any forest reserve. So that all settlers within the forest reserves have 160 acres or less. Some of them have good land and have it, or parts of it, irrigated, and have good homes, and are quite prosperous. But many of them have dry and arid and barren land, and their limited amount is not enough upon which to support a family, and they can not get any more within the forest reserves, principally because the Forest Service will not let them; so they must get some more land outside of the reserves if they can or practically starve out.

The Interior Department says that it is not fair to limit a man that happens to have 160 acres or less of that character of land in the forest reserve and not limit the man on the outside. So this bill has the hearty approval of the Interior Department to put the two classes of settlers as near as possible on an equality. That is all there is to this bill. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. GANDY] has a suggestion which he desires to make in the form of an amendment, and I have no objection to it. The bill as I wrote it requires a settler to take land only within 20 miles of his original claim. He calls my attention to the fact that in some cases settlers can not get outside of the forest reserve within 20 miles. In other words, we should extend the distance or remove the 20-mile limit and let the man take it any place on the outside of the forest reserve wherever he can find any such land vacant.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is this land in detached portions? In other words, if he has a location of 75 acres he can get the other 245 acres?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; outside of the forest reserve, the same as the present law is now, as applied to settlers outside of the reserves.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. And it must be of the same general character of land?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any homestead entryman of 160 acres or less of lands of the character described as subject to entry under the provisions of the enlarged-homestead act of February 19, 1909, and June 17, 1910, who has not submitted final proof upon his existing entry, and any homestead entryman who has submitted final proof, or received patent, for such an amount of lands that are of the character described in said act, and who owns and resides upon the said homestead entry, where said lands are within a national forest, may make an additional entry for and obtain patent to such an amount of land, of that same character, not in a national forest, and within a radius of 20 miles from said homestead entry, as, when the area thereof is added to the area of the original entry, will not exceed 320 acres, and residence upon the original entry shall be credited on both entries; but improvements must be made on the additional entry as required by said act.

SEC. 2. That any homestead entryman of 160 acres or less of lands of the character described as subject to entry under the provisions of the stock-raising homestead act of December 29, 1916, who has not submitted final proof upon his existing entry, and also any homestead entryman who has submitted final proof or received patent, for such an amount of lands that are of the character described as subject to entry under the provisions of the said stock-raising homestead act, and who owns and resides upon the said homestead entry, where said lands are within a national forest, may make an additional entry for and obtain patent to such an amount of land of that same character, not in a national forest and within a radius of 20 miles from said homestead entry, as, when the area thereof is added to the area of the original entry, will not exceed 640 acres, and residence upon the original entry shall be credited on both entries; but improvements must be made on the additional entry equal to \$1.25 for each acre thereof.

SEC. 3. That any person otherwise qualified who has obtained title under the homestead laws to less than one-quarter section of land may make an original entry and obtain title under the provisions of the enlarged-homestead act of February 19, 1909, and the act of June 17, 1910, for such an area of public lands designated thereunder, as will, when added to the area of the prior perfected entry, not exceed 320 acres, even though the former entry shall not have been designated, or be of the character subject to entry under the provisions of the said enlarged-homestead act.

SEC. 4. That any person otherwise qualified who has obtained title under the homestead laws to less than one-quarter section of land may make an original entry and obtain title under the provisions of the stock-raising homestead act of December 29, 1916, for such an area of public land designated thereunder, as will, when added to the area of their prior perfected entry, not exceed 640 acres, even though the former entry shall not have been designated, or be of the character subject to entry under the said stock-raising homestead act.

During the reading of the bill,

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This bill is subject to debate?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I desire to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. This is a Union Calendar bill, and should be read by sections. The Chair recognizes the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to interrupt the passage of the bill merely to call attention to the fact that here is another land law that hops back and forth between the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior. In this bill we are trying to relieve men who homesteaded within forest reserves, the forest reserves being under the control of the Agriculture Department. They are, however, to find lands which have been or may hereafter be designated or classified by the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Outside of the forest reserves.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. All this does is to allow a settler in the forest reserves to get another piece of arid land outside of the forest reserve sufficient in amount to make up, with what he has, the amount of 320 acres of dry-farming land or 640 acres of stock-raising land.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Yes; and that is all very well for a homesteader in a dry, treeless forest reserve, who is up against it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I know he is. I have some of them in my State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. He has 160 acres and can not do much of anything except scratch for a livelihood.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; and the poor fellow can not scratch hard enough on that kind of land to raise a family.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But he can hop outside of the control of the Agriculture Department and into the control of the Interior Department and get another 150 acres of land, but you do nothing for the forest reserve fellow who is in a real forest reserve.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. God knows I would like to do something for him if it were possible. I am as much in favor of doing that as is the gentleman.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. He is inside a real forest reserve. He went there and went right through the timber to get agricultural land.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is true in the gentleman's State of Washington, but in my State and most of its intermountains the settler I refer to in this bill is not in or near any timber and did not pass through any to get to where he has settled.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But this fellow that I am talking about is on a timber homestead in a forest reserve, where he has cleared 20 acres or so and is making a precarious living. He can not sell the timber.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not think his land would be designated as of this character. This bill will not apply to a settler on good land, or in timberland, only to dry land or rough or arid grazing land.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Absolutely not. That is it. He can not move. He can not get another piece of land outside.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No. The settler the gentleman refers to is in dead hard luck.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. He is surrounded by a forest reserve and until the Government wants to buy his timber or authorizes him to sell it he can not dispose of it.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is true; I fully realize that, and I would like to help him, but we can not do so in this bill. I am trying to relieve some settlers in my State.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And the laws prohibit him from burning it, so he has an elephant on his hands. But nobody gives him any sympathy, because he is supposed to have some potential value in timberland that in thirty, fifty, or a hundred years from now may be sold.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. But just because some of those settlers in his State are up against it the gentleman does not want to deprive many others of relief, does he?

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; but I want to point out that the effort is always to relieve the fellow in the dry-grass country, but that the fellow in the timber is supposed by somebody to have stung the Government, which is not the case. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The following committee amendments were severally reported and severally agreed to:

Page 1, line 4, strike out the words "of the character described" and insert "which have been or may hereafter be designated or classified by the Secretary of the Interior."

Page 1, line 11, after the word "lands," strike out the words "that are" and insert "which have been or may hereafter be designated or classified by the Secretary of the Interior as."

Page 2, line 10, after the word "but," strike out the word "improvements" and insert "cultivation."

Page 2, line 12, after the word "act," insert:

"For the purposes of this act the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to designate as subject to the enlarged homestead acts lands within national forests."

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "June 17, 1910," and insert "acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GANDY. Also the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 6, after the comma, strike out the words "and within a radius of 20 miles from said homestead entry" and insert, after the word "entries," in line 10, the following: "if the additional entry is not more than 20 miles from the original entry, otherwise the residence requirements of the homestead laws must be complied with."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 16, after the word "lands," strike out the words "of the character described" and insert "which have been or may hereafter be designated or classified by the Secretary of the Interior."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 9, after the word "thereof," insert:

"For the purposes of this act the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to designate under the stock-raising homestead act lands within national forests."

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that the amendment comes to the very nub of the matter I discussed a moment ago. The amendment reads:

For the purpose of this act the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to designate under the stock-raising homestead acts lands within national forests.

The Secretary of the Interior does not look after lands within the national forests.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me call attention to the fact that this language says "for the purposes of this act." Now, the purposes of this act are to allow a man who has some dry-farming land or stock-raising land in a forest reserve to take the same character of land outside, but it started out by saying, "Provided," virtually, "That the land has been now so designated." I call attention to the fact that the land has never been so designated yet, and we give authority to the Interior Department to designate before getting the benefit of that act, so that clause was put in there merely for the purpose of allowing the Interior Department to designate a piece of land that a man now has. It does not let him get any more land, it designates no more land, but if Mr. Jones has got now a 160-acre homestead in the forest reserve or dry-farming land which never has been designated as such the Interior Department will have the right to designate that man Jones's land as dry-farming land for the purpose of letting him get the benefit of this act. It does not encroach any on the forest reserves at all—

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I wish it did encroach a little.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The trouble is we can not do that.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman think now that the Interior Department fellow is to do some "designating" that he will go around with his surveying instruments and map-making devices?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No. It will only be on application. If a man applies to him and says, "I have been living here for 10 years on a piece of dry land; I can not irrigate it, it is arid land," he will ask to have the agent of the Interior Department, and they are the only ones who do that kind of work—ask to have one of those look at that land and report if it is the character of either an enlarged homestead or a stock-raising homestead, and if the agent of the Interior Department makes that report on that man's homestead then he will have the right to select outside.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I hope it will work that way, but I am afraid that it will result in duplications between the two departments, who will cross each other and be engaged

at the same time in doing the same work, all to the cost of the Government and to the confusion and detriment of the settler.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; the forest reserves we do not encroach upon at all.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I will.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The Secretary of the Interior does not designate areas within the national forests which should be withdrawn from forest reserves and devoted to agriculture?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No, not at all; and this bill does not give him any such authority.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman says that if any question arises whether or not these designated lands should be withdrawn the authority to designate is with the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman misunderstood me. I said the Interior Department is the only department that ever designates any land as dry-farming land subject to entry under the enlarged homestead act, or as stock-raising homestead land subject to entry under the 640-acre stock-raising homestead act, and if a man now has a homestead within a forest reserve—and there are thousands of them who have these arid dry-farming lands, which they can not irrigate, and they can not get more than 160 acres within a forest reserve under the present law—what the settler would have to do would be to apply to the Interior Department and ask them to send an agent to look at his homestead, and if the agent of the Interior Department reports that his homestead is of a character of land that is now designated, generally speaking, as dry-farming, enlarged homestead land, or as grazing, stock-raising homestead land, then he can make application for an additional tract of land outside the forest reserve. Now, the Forest Service has got nothing to do with that at all. That transaction does not affect the Forest Service at all.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I understand this amendment suggested by the committee—I will read it:

For the purposes of this act the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to designate under the stock-raising homestead act lands within national forests.

Now, pardon me just a moment. It seems to me that authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to invade the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture and go into the national forest and designate lands that thereafter shall not be under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No; the gentleman is mistaken. The lands now occupied by those homestead settlers are entered now under the homestead laws. They are not a part of the forest reserves and are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Agricultural Department. They are within the exterior boundaries of the forest reserves, but they are not a part of them; and until they make final proof and obtain a patent to their claims they are under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department.

Mr. GANDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I will.

Mr. GANDY. Now, all this proposed measure does is to provide that one within a forest reserve who has land of the character described in the enlarged homestead act or land of the character described in the section act may take such amount of that kind of land as will bring the total up to the total provided for either the enlarged homestead or the section act.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. This amendment authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to designate land within a forest reserve—

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. For the purposes of this act only.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. For such and such a purpose, whereas now he has not such authority. The only authority for designated lands within the national forests which shall be withdrawn from the national forests and devoted to any other purpose is placed under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture, and he must pursue the exact method pointed out by the law.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. When a man now has a homestead claim within a forest reserve, why he is already outside of the forest reserve, so far as jurisdiction is concerned, notwithstanding his land is within the reserve. He is not under the Agricultural Department at all; he is under the Interior Department.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. This bill does not let the Interior Department go one inch outside of its homestead claim.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. But this authorizes it to designate land for certain purposes within national forests.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No. It authorizes the Interior Department to designate the settlers' homestead claims only as to the character of its land.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is what the language means.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No. It says, "For the purposes of this act." What are the purposes of this act? To allow the homesteader who is now in the forest reserve and has got a valid existing homestead entry, and who is now under the jurisdiction of the Interior Department to-day—it allows the Interior Department to say whether or not that homestead is dry arid land, but not a foot outside of his own ground can the Secretary designate.

If the settler was outside of the reserve, he has a right to have 320 or 640 acres of it, owing to its character. My good friend from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] will tell you, and anybody from the West will tell you, that this bill does not encroach one inch upon the forest reserves or upon the Agricultural Department or its jurisdiction.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Of course, I listen to the gentleman from Oregon when he talks about these matters, and he knows a great deal more about them than I do, but I know the meaning of plain words, and in my judgment it authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to exercise authority over lands within the national forests.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. No. He is exercising authority only over lands now under his jurisdiction.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It does not say so, and it is not safeguarded at all, in my judgment.

Mr. SINNOTT. All this amendment means is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to examine the lands within the national forests to ascertain whether or not the present holding of the homesteader is of that character as to entitle him to take additional lands outside the forest. That is all this means.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. And that has nothing to do with the Agricultural Department or with the Forest Service.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. That is, in case the regular procedure has been taken, the Secretary of Agriculture having set aside this land within the national forests, and it having been located as a homestead, the Secretary of the Interior has the right to examine and determine the character of it, and determine whether the man has some other rights at some other place?

Mr. SINNOTT. That is right. Outside of the forest.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. It may be properly drawn for that purpose, but it did not occur to me that that was its meaning. I like to see legislation drawn in such a way that it has only one meaning, and the head of a department can do only one thing—that is, what the Congress intended.

Mr. SINNOTT. Under this act there is no right given in any forest reserve, and this designation is made for the purposes of this act.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Speaker, in line 20, page 2, after the figures "1916" and the comma, I move to amend by adding "and acts supplemental thereto and amendatory thereof."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Dakota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. GANDY: Page 2, line 20, after the figures "1916," insert "and acts supplemental thereto and amendatory thereof."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, strike out all of section 3.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 3, line 24, strike out all of section 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GANDY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to section 2, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 3, after the word "forest," strike out the words "and within a radius of 20 miles from said homestead entry" and insert, after the word "entries," the following: "if the additional entry is not more than 20 miles from the original entry, otherwise the residence requirements of the homestead laws must be complied with."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 37, noes 1.

So the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I notice that there are some other bills reported April 13 that are on this Calendar for Unanimous Consent. How does that happen?

The SPEAKER. The attention of the Chair has already been called to that. The Chair was going to state that he thinks those bills, while they are on the calendar, could not be considered to-day unless by special recognition of the Chair. Not having been considered will not injure their status.

THE VIRGIN ISLANDS.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to prefer a unanimous-consent request.

The commission that was appointed to visit the Virgin Islands and make report are filing their report to-day, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed as a public document of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks that the report referred to be printed as a public document. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be indulged for one moment to make a statement concerning this matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GARRETT. This report of the commission, of which I had the honor to be a member, is a unanimous report, and I think a most excellent one. I had nothing to do with drawing it, but I congratulate the gentleman who did draw it. I think it proper to say for the Record this, namely, that the commission reports that it is not deemed advisable at this time to undertake to change the plan of government now in operation. It suggests that there are some very vital and fundamental changes necessary in the system now in force, but proceeds upon the theory, and doubtless a correct one, that those now operating the government should first develop these new plans and processes. I think that is a correct idea.

I simply wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion, under the act of Congress—the date of which I have forgotten, but it was the act providing for the temporary government and our taking over the islands under the terms of the treaty—under that act, in my opinion, before the present government of the Virgin Islands can change their laws it will be necessary to have an enabling act by Congress. I think that should be said in order that those charged with responsibility in the Virgin Islands may clearly understand in the development of their laws and their new system that it will require an enabling act on the part of Congress. That enabling act, I have no doubt, Congress will be glad to give if the changes they make meet with the approval of Congress.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, the question that is suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] is an open question. The act by which we established the government in the Virgin Islands provided that the existing laws should be in effect until Congress changed them. However, the existing laws provide that the councils, which still continue in the islands, being the legislative assembly, should have the power to modify or to amend their laws whenever they so desire, so that there is a question as to just exactly how much power may be exercised by the existing councils.

Now, these councils have made, and are now making, a complete Americanization or recodification of the old Danish laws that have existed for many years in the islands. It was thought best by the commission that that work should be completed and that, in fact, it was best that they should be enacted by their local councils. It is always best that the local authori-

ties should pass their own laws, and then if they require any approval by act of Congress we may give them such approval as may be necessary. So I think it would be the unanimous idea of the commission that they should go on with their amendment and recodification of the laws, and that if any act of Congress is necessary to make them effective we can give it to them.

THE WOMEN'S BUREAU.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill that I am sending to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 13229) to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the women's bureau.

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be established in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the women's bureau.

SEC. 2. That the said bureau shall be in charge of a director, a woman, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive an annual compensation of \$5,000. It shall be the duty of said bureau to formulate standards and policies which shall promote the welfare of wage-earning women, improve their working conditions, increase their efficiency, and advance their opportunities for profitable employment. The said bureau shall investigate and report to the said department upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of women in industry. The director of said bureau may from time to time publish the results of these investigations in such a manner and to such extent as the Secretary of Labor may prescribe.

SEC. 3. That there shall be in said bureau an assistant director, to be appointed by the Secretary of Labor, who shall receive an annual compensation of \$3,500 and shall perform such duties as shall be prescribed by the Secretary of Labor.

SEC. 4. That there is hereby authorized to be employed by said bureau a chief clerk and such special agents, assistants, clerks, and other employees at such rates of compensation and in such numbers as Congress may from time to time provide by appropriations.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of Labor is hereby directed to furnish sufficient quarters, office furniture and equipment, etc., for the work of this bureau.

SEC. 6. That this act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands a second.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know about that. Why should it be? There is just a handful of people here.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. We can get them here.

Mr. CANNON. I guess you had better get them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] will take their places as tellers. As many as are in favor of a second will pass between the tellers and be counted.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 31, noes 0.

The SPEAKER. A second is ordered by tellers.

Mr. CANNON. I think a quorum is not present. I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois makes the point that there is no quorum present. It is clear that there is no quorum present.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

Andrews, Md.	Clark, Fla.	Fuller, Mass.	Kelley, Mich.
Baer	Collier	Gallagher	Kennedy, Iowa
Bankhead	Costello	Ganly	Kennedy, R. I.
Barkley	Crago	Gard	King
Begg	Cramton	Goldfogle	Kitchin
Bell	Cullen	Goodwin, Ark.	Kreider
Benson	Currie, Mich.	Goodykoontz	Lampert
Black	Curry, Calif.	Gould	Langley
Blackmon	Darrow	Graham, Pa.	Layton
Bland, Ind.	Davey	Greene, Vt.	Longworth
Bland, Va.	Davis, Tenn.	Hamill	McAndrews
Boies	Dempsey	Hamilton	McArthur
Boober	Denison	Harrison	McFadden
Brand	Dent	Hayden	McKenzie
Brinson	Dewalt	Heflin	McKinley
Britten	Dominick	Hicks	McLane
Browne	Doelling	Hill	McPherson
Brumbaugh	Doughton	Hudspeth	Madden
Burke	Drane	Hulings	Mann, Ill.
Campbell, Pa.	Dupré	Humphreys	Mansfield
Cantrill	Eagle	Hutchinson	Mason
Caraway	Edmonds	Igoe	Montague
Carew	Ellsworth	Johnston, N. Y.	Moon
Carter	Evans, Nev.	Jones, Pa.	Mooney
Casey	Flood	Jones, Tex.	Moore, Va.
Chindblom	Freeman	Juul	Moores, Ind.

Morin
Mott
Neely
Newton, Minn.
Newton, Mo.
Nolan
O'Connell
Paige
Pell
Phelan
Porter
Radcliffe
Rainey, J. W.
Rayburn
Reavis
Reber
Reed, N. Y.
Rogers
Rose
Rowan
Rowe
Rubey
Rucker
Sabath
Schall
Scully
Sears
Sells
Shreve
Siegel

Small
Smith, Ill.
Smith, N. Y.
Smithwick
Snell
Snyder
Steagall
Stedman
Steele
Steenerson
Stephens, Miss.
Stevenson
Stoll
Strong, Pa.
Sullivan

Tague
Taylor, Ark.
Taylor, Tenn.
Temple
Vaile
Vare
Walsh
Ward
Welty
Wheeler
Williams
Wilson, Pa.

The SPEAKER. On this vote 266 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] has 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has 20 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I desire that the gavel may fall when I have consumed as much as five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will notify the gentleman.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. This bill provides for the establishment under provisions of law in the Bureau of Labor of a woman's bureau. That bureau was created in the summer of 1918 and has been provided for by the Committee on Appropriations up until this time. The matter will undoubtedly be provided for in the appropriation bill this year, and it was thought to be the gracious and proper thing to do to pass a law under which that bureau should have an authorized existence in the Department of Labor.

Whatever else may be said, we may as well understand that from this time on women will have a greater part in the industries of the country in the future than they have had in the past. The war taught the women that they could perform useful labor in the industries of the country, and it also taught those engaged in industry that the women made good employees in many of the industries of the country. There is now no question about the necessity of providing for some regulatory measures for the proper employment of women. It is idle to say that their interests can be taken care of just as well by the Bureau of Labor under the control of men as under the control of women. If anyone will stop to consider for a moment, he will know that there are physical differences that the women understand, which make it important that provision be made in all the industries of the country for the methods under which the women work and for their accommodations while employed, which make it not only wise but humane that women shall have charge of this sort of thing.

I recall that a few years ago women employed in this city were not provided with the accommodations that humankind need. We passed a law making it necessary for those employing women to provide these human necessities for the women employed in those places. One of the men who strenuously opposed the measure providing for these necessities in his industry came back in six months and said that it was the best investment he had made in connection with his enterprise. He would not to-day be without the conveniences, the places for the women to rest, and so forth, that were provided for under that law. He would not dispense with them under any conditions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed five minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, if the proper conditions prevailed in our Department of Labor, which will have the appointment of some and the supervision of all of the employees in this woman's bureau, to be provided under this proposed legislation, I would be heartily in favor of this bill. I heartily favor a woman's bureau such as planned, although I am against establishing new bureaus, as the Government is already overriden with bureaus now. But I would vote for this woman's bureau were it not for the awful conditions now existing in the Department of Labor.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. May I make a suggestion to the gentleman?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment. I do not wish just yet to be interrupted in the remarks I am making just now. But I call the attention of my colleague to the dreadful conditions which prevail in the Department of Labor at this moment. Let me read some excerpts of speeches from the RECORD. I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 12, 1920, pages 5551-5552, excerpts from the speech of Hon. ALBERT JOHNSON of Washington, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Immigration:

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to the present situation concerning certain depor-

tation cases. I wish to call attention to the fact that this morning, if the Nickle Plate train from Chicago was on time, there arrived in New York from New Orleans one Paul Bosco, who is, in my opinion, a dangerous alien, an anarchist, and an enemy of this country. The evidence against this man was such that in New Orleans his application for release on bond was denied. Appeals were made to let him out on \$500 bond and denied. These appeals were made by New York attorneys who devote much time to the interests of Socialists, I. W. W.'s, and anarchists. Next the appeal was made to have the bond fixed at \$1,000, and to have the alien transferred to New York. Weinberger, who continuously represents anarchists, got this fellow's bond reduced to \$1,000, the bond to be placed at Ellis Island, New York, the man to be transferred from New Orleans to New York at Government expense, and there to be released on that bond, there to connive and bring about proceedings that will keep him in the country, even though he said at his hearing that he did not care to have an attorney; that he was perfectly willing to be deported; even though he stood up in the court room at Morgantown, W. Va., after he had been convicted, and said that he hoped the red flag would replace the Stars and Stripes in the United States at an early date.

Thus in no uncertain terms our chairman of the Immigration Committee, who has had one branch of the Department of Labor under investigation for some time, charges Louis F. Post, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Labor, with collusion with anarchists against the interests of this Government.

But let me quote further from the speech of this distinguished chairman of the Committee on Immigration:

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This alien Bosco believes in force against the Government. He wants the red flag in place of the Stars and Stripes. And yet, Mr. Speaker, I say that it is more than an even bet that he will never be deported from the United States.

Mr. BLANTON. That is what I have been telling the gentleman for months.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We have plenty of law. Something is the matter with the execution of it. When there is doubt, the decision is against the Government.

According to the newspapers on Saturday morning, the Assistant Secretary of Labor, in the case of Thomas Truss, of Baltimore, arrested as a communist and ordered deported, has ordered Truss released. He referred to this case at length as typical of the thousands which he will be called upon to decide, and will, I suppose, release ninety-five out of every one hundred thereof.

And, Mr. Speaker, this chairman of the Immigration Committee on April 12, 1920, placed in the RECORD data concerning anarchist cases evidencing that numerous anarchist enemies of this Government have been protected, favored, and released from deserved deportation by Louis F. Post, the Assistant Secretary of Labor.

But let me quote further from the gentleman's speech:

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Let me explain the situation: Here is the Department of Justice making a number of arrests, 2,700 or more, for deportation. The cases are turned over to the Department of Labor. The Commissioner of Immigration recommends deportation. The Assistant Secretary of Labor cancels the warrant. The Department of Justice can not make a charge against another department of the Government, or does not want to. But, if it answers the gentleman, here is the Department of Labor, through the Assistant Secretary, Mr. Post, resolving in favor of the alien wherever he can. The net result is that the large amount of money authorized by this Congress to be placed in the Department of Justice for arrest of radical and revolutionary persons has gone for little, and the further great amount placed in the hands of the Department of Labor for the deportation of such undesirable aliens has likewise gone for little. The law says the decision of the Secretary shall be final.

Now, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, the foregoing comes from the chairman of one of our committees which has had this matter under investigation and should know whereof he speaks. It is just what I have been telling you on the floor of this House during the past year or more, that the Department of Labor is turning loose dangerous anarchists faster than the Department of Justice can apprehend them, and when they are tried and convicted of anarchy and ordered deported they appeal their cases, and this Assistant Secretary of Labor, Louis F. Post, sets aside their deportation judgments and releases them to further prey upon this Government.

Now, let me read to you an excerpt from a recent speech of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. DAVEY]. I read from page 5671 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 14, 1920, as follows:

Mr. DAVEY. Right here I want to bring out one of the saddest things in the history of the last few months of our Government. That is the action of one Louis F. Post in the Department of Labor. He serves in a Democratic administration, in a Democratic department, but what I am going to say is not an indictment of the Democratic Party, and I hope that no thought of politics will be injected into this. If it were an indictment of my party, I would mighty soon get out of it, but it is not. We have down there in the Department of Labor a man whose sympathies evidently are with the enemies of our Government. [Applause.] Just a little while ago this same man Post, after the warrant for the deportation of Ludwig Martens had been issued, withdrew this warrant and held up the deportation. Under our laws he has the power to do that. Furthermore, although Martens is the avowed enemy of our country, the avowed representative of Bolshevik Russia, and comes here to spread his damnable doctrines, yet this man Post allowed Martens to go free without bail on the recognizance of his attorney, ex-Senator Hardwick, and he assured Mr. Hardwick that he would take no action without consulting him.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. Just one moment, and then I will yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas. Here is the Depart-

ment of Labor, with an Assistant Secretary who has final say in all deportation cases affecting anarchists, concerning whom numerous Members of this House have already expressed an absolute want of confidence. Numerous Members of this House have charged this Assistant Secretary of Labor with malfeasance in office, friendly to criminals, and with favoring the anarchist enemies of this Government by preventing their deportation; and there is a resolution pending right now in this House to impeach him, and I understand that it has met with such favorable approval from the steering committee that it will be brought up here within a day or two under a rule from the Rules Committee, which now brings in this rule seeking to make this legislation in order. Why do you not go higher up? Do you believe that for 14 long months an Assistant Secretary of Labor has protected dangerous anarchists in this country and prevented their deportation and released them, not one or two or three but hundreds of them, without the knowledge of his superior officer?

Do you not believe that after it was brought to the attention of the Secretary of Labor through the various speeches and resolutions here in the House, and he has taken no action whatever in removing Mr. Post, that the Secretary of Labor himself condones and approves of his action? What other conclusion can you reach? It is the only conclusion that a reasonable man can reach. Has not Secretary Wilson been trying to free the anarchist Mooney? Yet you now want to put another department in his hands for maladministration. If they understood present conditions, our good women would vote against this measure just now, until we clean up this department.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield now? Mr. BLANTON. In one moment; I have not quite finished. I have before me volume 1, No. 1, April, 1920, issue of the Knot-Hole, a magazine just out, published in Washington. It has for its front-page salutation the following:

Conceived in sin and brought forth in Washington. We have no high moral purpose in publishing this paper. The Knot-Hole is simply a two-faced undertaking without manners or morals.

And on its editorial page 4 we find that Hugh Reid is editor and the following admission:

The Knot-Hole is sometimes scurrilous.

On page 286 of the Congressional Directory for February, 1920, we find that this Hugh Reid is private secretary to this same Louis F. Post, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Labor; and on page 1044 of the Official Register we find that this Hugh Reid is drawing from this Government a salary of \$2,100, which, with his \$240 bonus, makes \$2,340 per annum. That is the salary he is drawing from the United States Government as secretary to Assistant Secretary Louis F. Post, of the Department of Labor, and at the same time he is editing a scurrilous magazine of this character. What does it do? It attacks Congressmen in a vicious way. It does not stop there. It attacks members of the Cabinet, and even the President himself—my President and your President. And yet you want to add another bureau to and put more employees in this Department of Labor. Here is a letter that I wrote Mr. Post on March 31 asking him whether or not Hugh Reid was one of his employees, and to this good day he has never answered it. Have I not the right to an answer as a Member of Congress? Not getting his answer, I had to find out some other way, by looking up the matter in the Directory and Official Register, that he was his private secretary, because I knew that Hugh Reid must be an employee of the Department of Labor as soon as I saw the scurrilous magazine edited by him and then found articles therefrom immediately reproduced in the Olden Advance, published in my district.

I am so glad that there is one man out of that Department of Labor that I do not know what to do. John B. Densmore is at last off the Government pay rolls to-day, thank God.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. BLANTON. In just a moment; I have not quite gotten through. You remember a year and a half ago when I began the fight against Densmore's \$10,000,000 bureau in the Department of Labor some of you could not quite agree with me at that time. Here is a list of those highly paid officers in his department that by my fight we have at last gotten practically all of them off the Government pay roll. Now, my good colleagues, you can see the purpose I had through an investigation that I made by hard work at night when some of you were asleep. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put in the RECORD this list showing the employees that were on the pay roll of this department here in Washington on February 5, 1919, and the most of which now we have succeeded in cutting off the pay roll, and thank God that we have at last gotten rid of John B. Densmore and much of his crowd.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a list which he referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The list is as follows:

*United States Employment Service—Salaries, administrative office,
Feb. 5, 1919.*

Title.	Number.	Rate.	Total.
Director general.....	1	\$6,000	\$6,000
Assistant director general.....	1	5,500	5,500
Assistant to director general.....	1	5,000	5,000
Do.....	2	3,500	7,000
Special assistant to director general.....	1	3,500	3,500
Assistant to director general.....	2	4,000	8,000
Do.....	1	3,500	3,500
Special representative.....	5	3,500	17,500
Do.....	2	3,000	6,000
Do.....	3	2,500	7,500
Special agent.....	1	4,000	4,000
Do.....	1	3,650	3,650
Do.....	4	3,500	14,000
Do.....	10	3,000	30,000
Do.....	10	2,500	25,000
Do.....	4	2,400	9,600
Do.....	5	2,250	11,250
Do.....	2	2,000	4,000
Director of division.....	4	4,000	16,000
Assistant director of division.....	1	3,500	3,500
Do.....	1	3,000	3,000
Assistant to director of division.....	1	3,600	3,600
Do.....	2	2,500	5,000
Do.....	1	2,250	2,250
Do.....	1	2,100	2,100
Do.....	1	2,000	2,000
Chief of section.....	1	4,500	4,500
Do.....	1	4,000	4,000
Do.....	1	3,500	3,500
Do.....	5	3,000	15,000
Do.....	2	2,700	5,400
Do.....	2	2,750	5,500
Do.....	3	2,500	7,500
Do.....	1	2,400	2,400
Assistant chief of section.....	2	3,000	6,000
Do.....	1	2,750	2,750
Do.....	1	2,500	2,500
Do.....	1	2,400	2,400
Do.....	1	1,800	1,800
Disbursing agent.....	1	2,750	2,750
Secretary (war labor policy board).....	1	4,500	4,500
Secretary.....	1	3,500	3,500
Do.....	2	3,000	6,000
Do.....	2	2,000	4,000
Do.....	1	1,800	1,800
Do.....	1	1,740	1,740
Do.....	1	1,500	1,500
Do.....	1	1,440	1,440
Clerk (senior).....	1	2,750	2,750
Do.....	1	2,620	2,620
Do.....	8	2,500	20,000
Do.....	1	2,400	2,400
Do.....	4	2,250	9,000
Do.....	1	2,220	2,220
Do.....	5	2,100	10,500
Do.....	5	2,000	10,000
Do.....	2	1,980	3,960
Do.....	10	1,860	18,600
Do.....	16	1,800	28,800
Clerk.....	1	1,740	1,740
Do.....	1	1,728	1,728
Do.....	1	1,720	1,720
Do.....	2	1,680	3,360
Do.....	14	1,620	22,680
Do.....	1	1,600	1,600
Do.....	2	1,560	3,120
Do.....	36	1,500	54,000
Do.....	1	1,440	1,440
Do.....	10	1,400	14,000
Do.....	23	1,380	31,740
Clerk (junior).....	61	1,320	80,520
Do.....	4	1,280	5,040
Do.....	65	1,200	78,000
Clerk (under).....	15	1,100	16,500
Do.....	12	1,080	12,960
Do.....	1	1,020	5,100
Do.....	1	1,000	1,000
Do.....	1	960	960
Do.....	1	900	900
Do.....	4	900	3,600
Do.....	1	780	780
Do.....	1	720	720
Do.....	1	600	600
Do.....	2	600	1,200
Telegrapher.....	2	1,600	3,200
Engineer.....	1	1,440	1,440
Electrician.....	1	1,320	1,320
Fireman.....	3	960	2,880
Messenger.....	2	1,320	2,640
Do.....	2	1,200	2,400
Do.....	1	1,080	1,080
Do.....	1	960	960
Do.....	6	900	5,400
Do.....	2	840	1,680
Do.....	1	780	780
Messenger (junior).....	10	720	7,200
Do.....	7	600	4,200

*United States Employment Service—Salaries, administrative office,
Feb. 5, 1919—Continued.*

Title.	Number.	Rate.	Total.
Messenger (junior).....	7	\$480	\$3,360
Watchman.....	1	1,200	1,200
Do.....	5	900	4,500
Elevator operator.....	2	900	1,800
Do.....	1	720	720
Skilled laborer.....	1	1,320	1,320
Do.....	1	1,140	1,140
Do.....	9	900	8,100
Do.....	1	780	780
Janitress.....	1	840	840
Charwoman.....	8	312	2,496
SPECIAL.			
Adviser on industrial relations.....	1	5,000	5,000
Special examiner.....	1	4,000	4,000
Special camp organizer.....	1	4,000	4,000
National field organizer.....	2	3,000	6,000
Do.....	1	2,400	2,400
Assistant to chairman (war labor policy board).....	1	2,750	2,750
Associate director, boys' working reserve.....	1	2,750	2,750
National director, boys' working reserve.....	1	2,500	2,500
Assistant to Federal director (in charge of farm labor).....	1	2,100	2,100
National director, women's land army.....	1	2,000	2,000
Assistant Federal State director (public service reserve).....	1	1,800	1,800
Director, negro economics.....	1	4,380	4,380
Assistant director, negro economics.....	1	1,740	1,740
Supervisor of negro economics.....	2	1,740	3,480
Total.....	513		\$61,214

Mr. BLANTON. Practically all the foregoing long list of useless employees have at last been gotten off of the pay roll, and no Government business has suffered, for there are more jobs now with good pay than there are men willing to work to fill them.

You will remember that during the debate on the sundry civil appropriation bill on Friday, February 28, 1919, I took the position that the balance of the previous appropriation made still available of \$1,543,400, supplemented by the \$1,800,000 provided for in H. R. 16187, passed that day, was amply sufficient to carry on the Employment Service, and I opposed the extra \$10,000,000 demanded by Director Densmore. And when Mr. WATKINS offered his amendment to grant this department the additional sum of \$10,033,808.10, I made a point of order against it, and the Chair sustained my point of order. Then the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GALLIVAN] offered his amendment to grant this sum of \$10,033,808.10 to this department, and again I made a point of order against it, which was sustained by the Chair. Then the renowned Socialist Member from New York, Mr. London, offered an amendment to grant it the sum of \$10,000,000, and I again made a point of order against it, which was sustained by the Chair. Then the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Decker, offered his amendment to grant the department \$10,000,000, and again I made a point of order against it, which the Chair sustained. And thus this \$10,000,000 was saved and not wasted, and now at last we have gotten most of these high-salaried, useless employees off of the pay roll.

Now, let me ask you one thing. Have you gentlemen an abiding confidence in this Assistant Secretary of Labor, Louis F. Post, who manages most of the business down there? He is the First Assistant Secretary of that Department of Labor, and has final say in anarchist cases. I am in favor of this legislation, and I would vote for it if that department could be cleaned out. But I will not vote for it now. It would have been cleaned out before this if unfortunately the President had not been taken sick. If he had not lost his health he would have cleaned it up so quick that it would have made their heads swim, but unfortunately he has not been able to look into these matters.

Are you willing to put this new bureau in the Department of Labor on the eve of passing upon impeachment proceedings against this Assistant Secretary? You may be willing, but I want to tell you that the people of this country are not willing that you shall do it. The people of the country are getting their eyes open on this question. Now I will yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas, chairman of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas that at most the Assistant Secretary of Labor can remain in office only 10 months and 11 days longer. Fortunately, the gentleman from Texas has not assailed the Woman's Bureau that has existed in the Department of Labor for two years or more. [Applause.]

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, no; and I do not oppose this legislation, but most of the employees will be controlled absolutely by the

Assistant Secretary, and my friend from Kansas knows it, and I am not willing for Mr. Post to have this responsibility. Now, I do not want him to take my time any further, because I want to yield to the gentleman from Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has four minutes remaining.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have more time. The gentleman from Texas is for this bill on its merits and has consumed all of the time except four minutes in repeating his labor arguments, which we have heard before. I am not lecturing him, but I ask unanimous consent of the House that the time may be extended 15 minutes for the gentleman from Kansas and 15 minutes for myself.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, may I modify that request and ask unanimous consent that the time be extended for 10 minutes, giving the gentleman from Illinois 14 minutes and I ask for no additional time? Will that be satisfactory to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CANNON. It will.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the time be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I voted to submit the amendment to amend the Constitution of the United States giving women suffrage. I have advocated woman suffrage in my own State, where, so far as the State constitution would allow, she has the right to vote. The constitutional convention, I have no doubt, will give her full rights. I am not opposed to the women. My mother was a woman, my wife was a woman, my two daughters living are women, and the great-great-granddaughter will be a woman. She is a mighty handsome kid right now. [Applause.]

This appropriation was made last year for \$40,000, which includes \$5,000 for the lady who is employed as the head of the bureau, and it was done as a war measure. Then there is in addition to her the assistant and also the chief clerk provided for. I think very likely this bureau ought to be continued. I heartily agree that the Children's Bureau, established long before the war, is headed by one of the most competent women in the United States. I was very glad when she was appointed and that she has retained her position. Women know better about children than we men do and have more to do with forming their character.

This appropriation is estimated for and has been considered by the Committee on Appropriations, of which I am a member, and I am informed is to be carried for the coming fiscal year in the sundry civil appropriation bill. I oppose this motion to suspend the rules and make this bureau permanent law, because I would like to see it tried out for another year, until we can get that much further along in unscrambling the eggs. I have favored it heretofore. I shall vote for the appropriation, whether this legislation is had or not. No doubt the head of the bureau will be continued with the same salary. But how wonderful it all is, and does it not beat all how men fall over themselves? My good friend from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] performs about this Department of Labor and attacks it all along the line. It is not perfect, and I hold no brief to defend much of its action. There are many good employees down there—I do not know how many—but I think we would better wait a little bit. Let us bide a wee before we rush in and move to suspend the rules and create this bureau permanently in the Department of Labor.

There are many of these departments that to some extent will need to be upset. It is all on a war basis now. Let us get our heads and see whether it ought to continue entirely along the line on this war basis. "Oh," said a friend to me, "CANNON, you can not afford to vote against this proposition, for women are voting now." I said, "I was once challenged years ago about the women voting," and I laughed and said it satisfied my woman audience when I said to them, "You women are as good politicians as we men; you bear the children, you nurture them, you form their character, and when politics comes up you take your share. You control your husbands more than they control you, and you mold the children; and what is to become of us poor men when, added to all of that, you vote?"

I say again that I have no objection to their voting. Oh, how gentlemen fall over themselves when they are assured that the House will have a chance when we report the sundry civil appropriation bill to continue this bureau! They tell us that the women will be angry unless they pass this legislation. The women not only bear the children and nurture them and control their husbands more than their husbands control them, but we are told that they must go to work. God grant that they will not have to work any more in any munition factories; that they will not have to work as the men return and pick up the burden

of doing the work. I want the women to become mothers who will build homes. I have no objection to their voting. That is all right; but how we do fall over ourselves! Being assured that this appropriation will be reported, gentlemen fall over themselves and move to suspend the rules and make this a permanent act of legislation.

Oh, I do not agree with Madam Roland. It is said that she said away back in the French Revolution, "The more I see of men, the better I like dogs." I suppose that was correct away back there in that great revolution, but it does not apply at present in its full force. But the more I see men just turning double somersaults, the more I hear them say that this is a good political move and that we ought not to turn it down, the more I am inclined to say to you that I do not think, whether this passes or does not pass, that it is going to affect 10 votes in the United States. [Applause.] If the time comes for me to determine what my course shall be in the future, I want to get rid of the fever heat that is all over the country; I want to see how much the general expenditures can be properly reduced. I do not want to reduce them in passion. I do not want to do it hurriedly; but propositions of this kind and many other kinds can well wait until we do get down to normal. That is all I have to say. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], it is very bad policy for the Congress to pass a law providing for this bureau and a very wise thing for the Committee on Appropriations to have appropriated for it. I do not quite get the logic of that sort of a situation. I yield five minutes—

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I thought the gentleman said he was not going to use any additional time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield two minutes—

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I have no objection to the five minutes, but I am going to ask to be recognized for the remainder of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. How does the time stand?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois has six minutes and the gentleman from Kansas 15 minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I do not quite understand why there should be any opposition to this measure. All of us who take the kindly and sympathetic view of the gentleman from Illinois would be happy if it were not necessary for women to engage in gainful occupations, if they were not required, as many of them are, to become wage earners.

But the fact is that a great many women are compelled to become wage earners, to go into the industries; and that being the case, I think it is not only proper, but right, just, and equitable, that special provision should be made in the Department of Labor for an organization that shall have their welfare in charge. We have such an organization now in temporary form in the Department of Labor, but it is best that that activity shall be carried on under definite legislation. The bill before us provides that legislation, and I am very much in hope that the vote for the legislation will be well-nigh unanimous. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. How many speeches has the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. CANNON. I propose to yield the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT] the remainder of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I was somewhat disappointed to hear the speech of the distinguished ex-Speaker, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. That speech was made a good many years ago, but it is too late now. The women of this country have been deprived of their rights for years. They are getting them now. This is not a question of expense, it is a question of absolute necessity. The women by virtue of the change in economical conditions of this country are no longer able to remain at home and do the work. They must go out in the field of actual activity and earn their living. The purpose of this bill is that the Government through this agency creates a women's bureau with a woman at the head, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, "to investigate and formulate standards and policies which shall promote the welfare of wage-earning women." Can anybody object to that? "Improve their working conditions." Can the people generally or any Member of this House object to "improving the working conditions of women"? No. "Increase their efficiency." Can there be any objection to increasing their efficiency? Clearly not. "And advance their opportunities for profitable employment." Everybody ought to be for that. We ought to be ready and willing to expend money for the purpose

of making that effective. "The said bureau shall investigate and report to the said department upon all matters pertaining to the welfare of women in industry." Anyone who has given this subject any thought or consideration realizes that while you may speak of the father and the son representing the wife, mother, or sister that day has passed. They want and are entitled to represent themselves. On May 20, 1919, I introduced H. R. 1134, referred to in the committee's report on this bill. I am for this legislation. It is right.

The sundry civil bill for the fiscal year 1919 carried as one of the war emergency items an appropriation of \$40,000 to enable the Secretary of Labor to carry on investigations touching women in industry, and this appropriation is carried in the current law. The purpose of the legislation now proposed is to make statutory provision for the work which is being carried on under the above-mentioned title and to provide for its enlargement as appropriations may be made for that purpose.

During the war hundreds of thousands of women took the places of men who had joined the Army and did men's work. Their efficiency and competency were proven in every branch of industry. There are still hundreds of thousands occupying important places and positions of trust and in manufacture and in trade.

The purpose of this bill is to create a permanent women's bureau in the Department of Labor and give it a legal status.

In the introductory part of the first annual report of the Director of the Woman in Industry Service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, we find the following:

The Woman in Industry Service was organized in July, 1918, a year and three months after the entrance of the United States into the war. It was confronted at once with the problems involved in a rapidly increasing reliance upon the work of women, as the sole reserve force of labor to be called upon to measure up to the demands of an augmented program of production for the war in the face of the withdrawal of men for military service at the rate of a quarter of a million a month. It was clear that for the sake of production and for the good of the Nation the Federal Government must provide not only for the recruiting of women workers, but for the safeguarding of the health and efficiency of these women who were meeting in many instances the requirements of new and unaccustomed tasks. Because they were new for women—at least, in such large numbers—standards for their employment had not been established in the customs of industry.

On page 5 of such report we find the following specific statement of the purpose of this service:

1. To consider all general policies with respect to women in industry and to advise the Secretary of Labor as to the policies which should be pursued.
2. To keep informed of the work of the several divisions of the department in so far as they relate to women in industry and to advise with the divisions on all such work.
3. To secure information on all matters relating to women in industry and to collate such information into useful form.
4. To establish useful connections with all governmental departments and divisions on this subject and with voluntary agencies and societies.

In the hearings before your committee the following letter of the Secretary of Labor appears:

MARCH 4, 1920.

GENTLEMEN: As I am unable to be present at your joint hearing to-day for consideration of H. R. 12679 and S. 4002, to establish on a statutory basis the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, I am sending you this letter to urge a favorable report by the committee.

This bill does not propose a new bureau. The present Women's Bureau was made possible by the appropriation for the War Labor Administration in July, 1918, and so proved the necessity for it that it was continued by a special appropriation in 1919. It is common knowledge that during the war the number of women in industry increased greatly and the range of the occupations open to them was extended. It is even more important than before the war, therefore, that there should be a bureau in the Federal Government concerned with the special problems of women in industry.

The enlarged appropriation is made necessary in order to meet the many demands for the services of the bureau which comes from State departments of labor and citizens throughout the Nation who realize the importance of improving the conditions of the employment of women in industrial occupations.

Very truly, yours,

W. B. WILSON.

III. INDUSTRIES, TOTAL NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES, AND NUMBER OF WOMEN EMPLOYEES INVESTIGATED.

In the course of two general State surveys of working conditions for women, and of several studies of conditions involving groups of women in special industries, the Women's Bureau has secured information on the actual working conditions of approximately 34,000 women employed in industries where the total number of employees amounted to approximately 75,000. The two largest groups of women, 12,000 and 18,000, were covered by State surveys made in Indiana and Virginia. In these two surveys conditions in the representative industries of the State where women were employed were the subject of investigation. The establishments covered included those manufacturing boots and shoes, caskets, clothing, drugs, food products, hosiery and knit goods, leather goods, metal products, paper and paper products, peanuts, pottery and glassware, rubber goods, textiles, tobacco, wood products, printing establishments, and laundries.

The bureau sought to be established is not an experiment or a new adventure. It has proven its worth, and now that the right of self-government has been extended to women their demands are entitled to favorable consideration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RAKER. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have six minutes left. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MERRITT].

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, what I object to about this bill has nothing to do with the merits of the employment of women in industry. It is admitted that these very women whose positions in the Bureau of Labor are provided for by this bill are now employed and will be employed and will do exactly the same work that the bill calls for the next two years whether this bill passes or not. What I object to is putting into permanent law a temporary war expedient just at a time when everybody knows that every department of the Government, including the Department of Labor—I do not agree with all the criticism by the gentleman from Texas, although probably there is a good deal of basis for it—when every department, now that the war is over, and when the general election is over should be investigated with the idea of reorganizing it along new lines, along efficient lines, along economical lines, and therefore we should as business men look at this proposition in a businesslike way. What is the sense of putting this bureau into permanent law which will make any reorganization of it more difficult. It will not help the women one iota. I acknowledge that women in industry ought to be taken care of and I am in favor of doing anything necessary to that end, but this bill does not give them any additional care, and all it does is to confuse the operation of the Government. It is a bill to increase the confusion and not to help the women. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CARSS].

Mr. CARSS. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I favored the passage of this bill in the committee, and I am in favor of it now. As much as many of us deplore that women have to give up homemaking and go out in the world to make a living we find that condition existing to-day and we have to meet it.

There are about 13,000,000 women wage earners in the United States to-day. They are in industry, and they are going to remain in industry, and if we are to retain the health of the coming generation and raise a rugged, virile race of people, we have got to provide for those women in industry, and we have got to establish a bureau that will make inspection and report the conditions, and see that those women are protected from anything that might tend to injure their potential motherhood. We might as well face the facts in this case. I hope this bill will be passed. I am very much in favor of it, and I would like to see it become a permanent law so that it can not be knocked out on a point of order.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have two minutes remaining. I had supposed that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. CARSS], holding the views that he does, would have gotten his time from the other side. But that is all right. It does not make much difference one way or another. Now, in my two minutes I do not know that I can add anything to what I have already said. I think there is more little peanut politics in this motion to suspend the rules than there is merit. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MACCRATE].

Mr. MACCRATE. Mr. Speaker, I can not understand just what the gentleman from Illinois meant by "peanut politics" so far as this particular measure is concerned. Surely it is no small matter to legislate for 13,000,000 women who are members of our families. The Committee on Labor considered several proposals for the establishment of a women's bureau, one of which carried an appropriation of \$100,000 and another more than \$50,000 and another about \$40,000. By this bill we provide for a chief and keep control of the bureau in the hands of our Appropriations Committee. We held extended hearings and heard many witnesses. The committee insistently inquired what purpose the bureau would serve not now served by an existing governmental department. With a majority of this Congress we feel that new ventures should not be undertaken unless absolutely justifiable, and in determining to report this bill in its present shape we were greatly influenced by the testimony of the head of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Mr. Meeker. He was asked if he believed the bureau should be established, and he emphatically replied that it should be. He was asked why his department could not do the work, and he answered there was a different point of view taken by a woman when she went to investigate industries. He was asked if his appropria-

tion was increased could he do the work as well as a separate bureau would do it, and he said he could not. We asked him if a woman was made associate with him would that serve the purpose, and he said it would not. We inquired if he had had more money in the past could he have done the work of the proposed bureau as well as it could, and he said it is not a question of money, it is a question of human differences. A man can not see as well as a woman what effect a given industry will have on women, and although Mr. Meeker must have realized that the creation of this bureau would not increase his authority, he advocated its creation with a woman at its head. [Applause.]

Men may deeply regret the entrance of women into the commercial, industrial, and professional fields, and long for the days when the spinning wheel helped to make the family income meet the family's needs. But modern mechanical genius has made machinery respond to the touch of a woman's hand or foot. Commerce has taken many forms, and women are seen in all sorts of positions. It might have been better for society had the home industries been maintained, but we are face to face with a fact of life and not a social theory. Women, young and old, daily go to the office, shop, farm, and factory to earn their bread in the sweat of their brow. By this bill we seek to know what effect womanhood has on industry and industry has on womanhood. We are providing a means whereby knowledge of modern methods may be distributed to all the employers of the country and whereby both the woman and her employer may know where she can be employed for her own good as well as the good of her employer. We are to furnish a means by which those who toil and those who employ the toiler will gain the information which will make for mutual understanding.

The necessity for meeting the increased cost of existence is driving more and more women from the home into the industrial and commercial world. Men would prefer that their daughters should not be forced to stand amid the roar of belting and machinery, but they find themselves unable to meet unending rental and food price raises. Within the past year not only have daughters been forced to help their fathers, but countless wives have found that, save and stint as they might, the end of the week found them in debt, and they, too, have been obliged to work.

We have listened to men discuss the burden resting upon officials who administer the financial affairs of the city, State, and Nation, and we have wondered what these governmental experts would do were they limited to incomes as are the women of our homes. Governmental officials are continually exceeding the amount allotted to their departments and Congress, too frequently without condemnation, appropriates more. Did the average housewife of America spend what comes to her from the family with the open-handed carelessness of some departmental heads the unrest which we see about us would be multiplied a thousandfold. It is utterly impossible to calculate what the women of America are doing to-day toward keeping down riot and revolution. On pay day they get a definite amount which must cover a definite period. There are no sources from which it can be increased before the next pay day. Yet somehow or other, in spite of many demands unforeseen, the average American home-keeper keeps the family free from debt. If our efficiency experts in the field of government could make a little go as long a way and could adjust expenditures to income as well as do the women of our household, this Nation would soon see its indebtedness reduced. With prices outstepping wages the task of keeping contentment in our homes has been tremendously increased, but our womanhood are meeting the task heroically.

It may be that multitudes of the women who work will never become housewives and mothers. Nevertheless, the great majority of them will not keep at out-of-home tasks all their lives, but will become the joint makers of American homes. Industry may or may not affect women, so far as home making is concerned, but can we do the future a greater service than establish this bureau which will gather the facts from which we can accurately say just what effect industry does have on our womanhood? It may be America has other foundations but we are certain it has none more sure than its families kept contented by the tact and skill and love of its womanhood.

Mr. CARSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maine, Judge HERSEY.

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas for added honor.

As a member of the Committee on Labor I wish to add this: The committee had exhaustive hearings upon this bill. We heard all sides, and the committee made a unanimous report in favor of the legislation, amending, of course, the many claims and reducing it to a simple matter of business. Gentlemen, there is no woman suffrage in this bill. Gentlemen, there is no attempt in this bill to impeach any member of the Cabinet. There is no attempt in this bill to examine into the work of an Assistant Secretary of Labor. We had no jurisdiction to do that. But we simply recommend to you, gentlemen, as a matter of business, that the Woman's Bureau in the Department of Labor, that did such efficient work during the war, on a temporary, as we might say, war emergency should be continued in times of peace for the next fiscal year. And for this reason: Nobody who has examined the question for one moment would claim but that the bureau is needed and is efficient. Anyone who has examined it must admit that. It should be continued. But we know this, that should the matter come up for permanent law there would be some one in this House, and you can mention the name, who would rise up and say, "I will make a point of order against that," and out it would go, and the bureau must expire for want of appropriations. Let it become a law. All that there is to it is to take this matter which has been temporary and make it permanent law for the next fiscal year. Why? Because you can make the bureau more efficient thereby. You place a woman in authority, with assistants under her to gather information, and that is all it is, of the 13,000,000 women in industry, as to the hours of labor, the conditions under which they labor, and what can be done to improve their condition. The economy of this measure demands this legislation and it should have a unanimous passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The SPEAKER resumed the chair.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 109, noes 7.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the House having divided, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees. Those in favor of suspending the rules and passing the bill will, as their names are called, answer "yea" and those opposed will answer "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 256, nays 9, not voting 162, as follows:

YEAS—256.

Ackerman	Crowther	Hastings	McDuffie
Almon	Dale	Hawley	McGlennon
Anderson	Dallinger	Hayden	McKeown
Andrews, Nebr.	Davis, Minn.	Hays	McKiniry
Ashbrook	Dickinson, Mo.	Hernandez	McLaughlin, Mich.
Aswell	Dickinson, Iowa	Hersey	McLaughlin, Nebr.
Ayres	Donovan	Hersman	MacCrate
Babka	Dowell	Hickey	MacGregor
Bacharach	Dunbar	Hoch	Magee
Baer	Dupré	Holland	Maher
Barbour	Dyer	Houghton	Major
Barkley	Eagan	Howard	Mann, S. C.
Bee	Echols	Huddleston	Mansfield
Benham	Elliott	Hudspeth	Mapes
Bland, Ind.	Emerson	Hull, Iowa	Martin
Bland, Mo.	Esch	Hull, Tenn.	Mason
Boles	Evans, Mont.	Ireland	Mays
Bowers	Evans, Nebr.	Jacoway	Mead
Box	Evans, Nev.	James	Michener
Briggs	Fairfield	Johnson, Ky.	Miller
Britten	Ferris	Johnson, Miss.	Milligan
Brooks, Ill.	Fess	Johnson, S. Dak.	Minahan, N. J.
Brooks, Pa.	Fields	Johnson, Wash.	Monahan, Wis.
Browne	Fisher	Kahn	Mondell
Buchanan	Focht	Keller	Moore, Ohio
Burdick	Fordney	Kelly, Pa.	Morgan
Burroughs	Foster	Kendall	Mott
Butler	Frear	Kiess	Murphy
Byrnes, S. C.	French	Kincheloe	Nelson, Mo.
Byrns, Tenn.	Fuller, Ill.	Kinkaid	Nelson, Wis.
Caldwell	Gallivan	Klecza	Newton, Minn.
Campbell, Kans.	Gandy	Knutson	Nichols, Mich.
Campbell, Pa.	Garrett	Kraus	O'Connor
Candler	Glynn	Lanham	Ogden
Carss	Godwin, N. C.	Lankford	Oldfield
Carter	Good	Larsen	Oliver
Casey	Goodall	Lazaro	Olney
Christopherson	Goodykoontz	Lee, Calif.	Osborne
Clark, Mo.	Graham, Ill.	Lee, Ga.	Overstreet
Clason	Greene, Mass.	Lehibach	Padgett
Cleary	Griest	Leshner	Park
Connally	Griffin	Little	Parker
Cooper	Hadley	Loneragan	Parrish
Copley	Hardy, Colo.	Luce	Peters
Crago	Hardy, Tex.	Lubring	Platt
Crisp	Harreld	McClintic	Purnell

Quin	Sanders, La.	Taylor, Ark.	Watson
Rainey, Ala.	Sanders, N. Y.	Taylor, Colo.	Weaver
Rainey, H. T.	Sanford	Thomas	Webster
Rainey, J. W.	Scott	Thompson	Welling
Raker	Sherwood	Tillman	Whaley
Randall, Calif.	Sims	Timberlake	Wheeler
Randall, Wis.	Sinclair	Tincher	White, Kans.
Reed, W. Va.	Sinnot	Tinkham	White, Me.
Rhodes	Slemp	Towner	Wilson, La.
Ricketts	Smith, Idaho	Treadway	Wingo
Riddick	Smith, Ill.	Upshaw	Wood, Ind.
Riordan	Stephens, Ohio	Vestal	Woods, Va.
Robinson, N. C.	Stiness	Vinson	Woodyard
Robison, Ky.	Strong, Kans.	Volgt	Wright
Romjue	Summers, Wash.	Volstead	Yates
Rouse	Summers, Tex.	Walters	Young, N. Dak.
Rucker	Sweet	Wason	Zihlman
Sanders, Ind.	Swope	Watkins	

NAYS—9.

Blanton	Garner	Venable	Young, Tex.
Cannon	Merritt	Wise	
Coady	Sisson		

NOT VOTING—162.

Andrews, Md.	Ellsworth	Lampert	Rogers
Anthony	Elston	Langley	Rose
Bankhead	Flood	Layton	Rowan
Begg	Freeman	Linthicum	Rowe
Bell	Fuller, Mass.	Longworth	Rubey
Benson	Gallagher	Lufkin	Sabath
Black	Ganly	McAndrews	Schall
Blackmon	Gard	McArthur	Scully
Bland, Va.	Garland	McCulloch	Sears
Booher	Goldfogle	McFadden	Sells
Brand	Goodwin, Ark.	McKenzie	Shreve
Brinson	Gould	McKinley	Siegel
Brumbaugh	Graham, Pa.	McLane	Small
Burke	Green, Iowa	McPherson	Smith, Mich.
Cantrill	Greene, Vt.	Madden	Smith, N. Y.
Caraway	Hamill	Mann, Ill.	Smithwick
Carew	Hamilton	Montague	Snell
Chindblom	Harrison	Moon	Snyder
Clark, Fla.	Haugen	Mooney	Stegall
Cole	Heffin	Moore, Va.	Stedman
Collier	Hicks	Moore, Ind.	Steele
Costello	Hill	Morin	Steenerson
Cramton	Hoey	Mudd	Stephens, Miss.
Cullen	Hulings	Neely	Stevenson
Currie, Mich.	Humphreys	Newton, Mo.	Stoll
Curry, Calif.	Husted	Nicholls, S. C.	Strong, Pa.
Darrow	Hutchinson	Nolan	Sullivan
Davey	Igoe	O'Connell	Tague
Davis, Tenn.	Jefferis	Paige	Taylor, Tenn.
Dempsey	Johnston, N. Y.	Pell	Temple
Denison	Jones, Pa.	Phelan	Tilson
Dent	Jones, Tex.	Porter	Valle
Dewalt	Juul	Pou	Vare
Dominick	Kearns	Radcliffe	Walsh
Dooling	Kelley, Mich.	Ramsey	Ward
Doremus	Kennedy, Iowa	Ramseyer	Welty
Doughton	Kennedy, R. I.	Rayburn	Williams
Drane	Kettner	Reavis	Wilson, Ill.
Dunn	King	Reber	Wilson, Pa.
Eagle	Kitchin	Reed, N. Y.	
Edmonds	Kreider	Rodenberg	

So, two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. McPHERSON with Mr. WELTY.
 Mr. KREIDER with Mr. GANLY.
 Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. BOOHER.
 Mr. HULINGS with Mr. PELL.
 Mr. TEMPLE with Mr. POE.
 Mr. MORIN with Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. McKINLEY with Mr. BRAND.
 Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. McLANE.
 Mr. BURKE with Mr. COLLIER.
 Mr. GOULD with Mr. JONES of Texas.
 Mr. LAYTON with Mr. IGOE.
 Mr. MUDD with Mr. TAGUE.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.
 Mr. FREEMAN with Mr. BRINSON.
 Mr. McKENZIE with Mr. DOOLING.
 Mr. CHINDBLUM with Mr. HUMPHREYS.
 Mr. McCULLOCH with Mr. STOLL.
 Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
 Mr. BEGG with Mr. DAVEY.
 Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. HOEY.
 Mr. LUFKIN with Mr. STEVENSON.
 Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. SISSON.
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. KETTNER.
 Mr. JUUL with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. RADCLIFFE with Mr. NEELY.
 Mr. CURRIE of Michigan with Mr. LINTHICUM.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. HAMILL.
 Until further notice:
 Mr. LONGWORTH with Mr. KITCHIN.
 Mr. MANN of Illinois with Mr. DEWALT.
 Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. BELL.
 Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. NEWTON of Missouri with Mr. SMALL.
 Mr. WILLIAMS with Mr. STEAGALL.
 Mr. DENISON with Mr. BANKHEAD.
 Mr. SHREVE with Mr. CARAWAY.
 Mr. WARD with Mr. GALLAGHER.
 Mr. CURRY of California with Mr. DRANE.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. SCULLY.
 Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. BENSON.
 Mr. WALSH with Mr. FLOOD.
 Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. HARRISON.
 Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
 Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. DENT.
 Mr. HICKS with Mr. MONTAGUE.
 Mr. MOORES of Indiana with Mr. PHELAN.
 Mr. VARE with Mr. BLACK.
 Mr. TILSON with Mr. CANTRILL.
 Mr. DARROW with Mr. O'CONNELL.
 Mr. MADDEN with Mr. HEFLIN.
 Mr. DUNN with Mr. GARD.
 Mr. GARLAND with Mr. BLAND of Virginia.
 Mr. McARTHUR with Mr. STEDMAN.
 Mr. HAUGEN with Mr. MOON.
 Mr. ROWE with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.
 Mr. COLE with Mr. DOMINICK.
 Mr. LAMPERT with Mr. MOONEY.
 Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. McANDREWS.
 Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania with Mr. DOREMUS.
 Mr. REBER with Mr. CULLEN.
 Mr. ROGERS with Mr. CAREW.
 Mr. ROSE with Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina.
 Mr. SNYDER with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
 Mr. KEARNS with Mr. SULLIVAN.
 Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. RUBEY.
 Mr. HUSTED with Mr. ROWAN.
 Mr. SMITH of Michigan with Mr. SMITH of New York.
 Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.
 Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. DOUGHTON.
 Mr. REAVIS with Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee.
 Mr. PAIGE with Mr. SMITHWICK.
 Mr. SNELL with Mr. RAYBURN.
 Mr. SELLS with Mr. EAGLE.
 Mr. SIEGEL with Mr. BLACKMON.
 Mr. PORTER with Mr. SEARS.
 Mr. REED of New York with Mr. SABATH.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. MACCRATE, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana presented the following conference report and statement of the House conferees for printing under the rule.

The Clerk read the conference report and statement, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT.

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on a certain amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12610) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"The Bureau of Efficiency, together with its books, papers, and records, furniture, equipment, and supplies, is hereby transferred to the jurisdiction of Congress; and its officers and employees are transferred in their present status without reappointment. The Chief of the Bureau of Efficiency shall hereafter be appointed jointly by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives and may be removed from office by them. All other employees of the bureau, including a disbursing officer for the payment of the salaries and expenses of the bureau, shall be appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws and regulations. The Bureau of Efficiency is authorized to investigate any matters relating to the organization, activities, or methods of business of the several administrative services of the Government whenever directed by either House of Congress or requested by the heads

of such services and shall from time to time submit to Congress reports of its investigations with recommendations looking to greater efficiency and economy in the conduct of the public business. It shall make such special investigations and reports as may be required by either House of Congress or by any committee or subcommittee thereof of either House having jurisdiction over appropriations and expenditures. Administrative officers and employees of the executive departments and other establishments shall furnish authorized representatives of the Bureau of Efficiency with all information that the bureau may require for the performance of its duties, and shall give such representatives access to all records and papers that may be needed for that purpose."

And the Senate agree to the same.

WM. R. WOOD,
EDWARD H. WASON,
T. U. Sisson,

Managers on the part of the House.

F. E. WARREN,
REED SMOOT,
LEE S. OVERMAN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate amendment No. 53 to the bill (H. R. 12610) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, submit the following written statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees as to the said amendment:

On No. 53: Inserts the paragraph, proposed by the Senate, transferring the Bureau of Efficiency from the executive branch of the Government to the jurisdiction of Congress and modifies the Senate amendment in the following manner: Provides that the chief of the bureau may be removed from office by joint action of the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House instead of by concurrent resolution; limits the investigations of the bureau relating to the organization, activities, or methods of business of the administrative services of the Government to those which may be directed by either House of Congress or those which may be requested by the heads of such administrative services; limits the special investigations and reports which may be required by either House or any committee thereof to those requested by committees having jurisdiction over appropriations or expenditures and extends the authority for requesting such investigations to any subcommittee of either House having jurisdiction of appropriations and expenditures.

WM. R. WOOD,
E. H. WASON,
T. U. Sisson,

Managers on the part of the House.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 3238. An act relating to detached service of officers of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3895. An act authorizing the granting of certain irrigation easements in the Yellowstone National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 12581. An act granting the consent of Congress to the village and township of Shelly, Norman County, Minn., and the township of Caledonia, Traill County, N. Dak., and their successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North on the boundary line between the said States; and

H. R. 12260. An act to amend section 600 of the act approved September 8, 1916, entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled joint resolution of the following title:

S. J. Res. 180. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to turn over to agricultural fertilizer distributors or users a supply of nitrate of soda.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MOORES of Indiana, for 15 days, on account of important business.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Tuesday, April 20, 1920, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Postmaster General, submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the Post Office Department for inland transportation by star routes, payable from postal revenues, fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 731); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, submitting a proposed paragraph of legislation authorizing payment from existing appropriations to Hon. J. W. Harrold, being unpaid rent due him by the Department of Agriculture, but withheld under section 114 of the Penal Code (H. Doc. No. 732); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of private act No. 37, Sixty-sixth Congress, "An act for the relief of the estate of John M. Lea, deceased," approved April 7, 1920, and to state that the said act does not provide an appropriation for payment of the same, as defined in the act of June 30, 1906 (H. Doc. No. 733); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4. A report from the joint commission appointed under authority of House concurrent resolution 46, of the Sixty-sixth Congress, on conditions in Virgin Islands (H. Doc. No. 734); to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting two paragraphs of legislation for inclusion in the pending sundry civil appropriation bill required for the Public Health Service (H. Doc. No. 735); to the Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and Printing and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to amend sections 8 and 9 of the Panama Canal act and to authorize a blended system of practice and procedure in the district court of the Canal Zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. GANDY, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9899) to provide for the disposition of abandoned portions of rights of way granted to railroad companies, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 851), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VESTAL, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 12350) to fix standards for hampers, round-stave baskets, and splint baskets for fruits and vegetables, to establish a standard box for apples, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 852), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANGLEY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9944), authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to accept on behalf of the United States the donation by Sedgwick Post, No. 10, Grand Army of the Republic, of its memorial hall property in Bedford, Taylor County, Iowa, for Federal building purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 854), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOOD, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13677) making appropriations to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for the Federal control of transportation systems and to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 853), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. JOHNSON of Mississippi, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 10002) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue patent to R. L. Credille, mayor of the village of Bonita, La., in trust, for certain purposes, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 850), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 13677) making appropriations to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for the Federal control of transportation systems and to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. SINCLAIR: A bill (H. R. 13678) to amend the war-finance corporation act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 13679) granting a certain right of way with authority to improve the same across the old canal right of way between Lakes Union and Washington, King County, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DICKINSON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 13680) to amend the Federal reserve act as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NOLAN: A bill (H. R. 13681) to extend temporarily the time for filing applications for letters patent, for taking actions in the United States Patent Office with respect thereto, for the reviving and reinstatement of applications for letters patent, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BAER: A bill (H. R. 13682) to prevent gambling in the necessities of life and speculation in stocks and bonds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MASON: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 55) to withdraw our troops from Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CRAGO: A bill (H. R. 13683) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. McKinley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 13684) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FESS: A bill (H. R. 13685) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin C. Moffett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 13686) granting a pension to William McCall; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUSTED: A bill (H. R. 13687) granting a pension to Martin Hunt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 13688) granting a pension to Samuel C. Shattler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 13689) granting a pension to Alexander Yagle; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: A bill (H. R. 13690) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hammelmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAHER: A bill (H. R. 13691) granting a pension to James Flanagan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 13692) granting a pension to Samuel L. Hannon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PADGETT: A bill (H. R. 13693) granting an increase of pension to William Gilbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SANFORD: A bill (H. R. 13694) granting a pension to Agnes Crawford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13695) granting a pension to Hannah B. Kesler; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3057. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Rotary Club of Mount Vernon, N. Y., regarding the welfare of the Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3058. Also (by request), petition of I. W. Person Post, No. 14, American Legion, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging increased pay for enlisted and commissioned personnel of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

3059. Also (by request), petition of William H. Dexter and other citizens of Springfield, Mass., asking legislation to provide new site and building in that city for post office, customhouse, and other Federal activities; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

3060. Also (by request), petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, urging the acceptance of an American mandate in the near east; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3061. Also (by request), petition of Stuffed Toy and Doll Makers' Union of Greater New York and the Conqueror Club of Greater New York, asking release of Eugene V. Debs and other political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3062. By Mr. DYER: Petition of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., under the auspices of St. Louis Council of the Friends of Irish Freedom, urging the passage of the Mason bill, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3063. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of the National Association of Box Manufacturers of Chicago, urging the repeal of the excess-profits tax and a substitute of a tax on sales; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3064. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of John J. Hartigan, commander Michael J. Perkins Post, No. 67, American Legion, and 75 other members of this post, favoring cash bonus for all World War veterans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3065. Also, petition of American War Veterans Association, Alfred A. Shea, A. J. Fernald, Daniel J. Curran, Samuel M. Rachlin, all of the city of Boston, Mass.; John J. Murphy and William R. Powers, of Dorchester, Mass.; Representative Vernon W. Evans, Saugus, Mass.; and Daniel J. Welsh, Portland, Oreg., relative to the bonus for the ex-service men of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3066. By Mr. JOHNSTON of New York: Petition of executive board of the Cap and Millinery Cutters' Union, Local No. 2, U. C. H. and C. M. of North America, New York, relative to the American civil and military prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3067. By Mr. KEARNS: Petition of the Peebles Paving Brick Co. and the Stockham Co., both of Portsmouth, Ohio, and the J. & H. Classgens Co., New Richmond, Ohio, relative to House bills 12379 and 12646; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3068. Also, petition of Winn Farmer, of Piketon, Ohio, urging the passage of the MacGregor bill relative to an import duty on canaries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3069. By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution adopted by citizens of Newport, R. I., favoring passage of House resolution 3404, the Mason resolution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3070. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska: Petition of sundry citizens of Osceola, Nebr., requesting the adoption of resolution now pending in the Senate, providing that America shall assist in protecting Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3071. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Henry Hegwer, commander in chief and corresponding secretary of the United Indian War Veterans, urging the passage of House bill 13052 and Senate bill 4101; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

3072. Also, petition of Walter F. Ballinger, of Philadelphia, Pa., urging the United States to enter the League of Nations with or without reservations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3073. Also, petition of the National Association of Box Manufacturers, Chicago, Ill., relative to the excess-profits tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3074. By Mr. RAKER: Petition of the home economics department of the Vallejo High School, urging the passage of the Fess bill, House bill 12078; to the Committee on Education.

3075. Also, petition of H. D. Loveland, of San Francisco, Calif., urging the passage of House bill 11729; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3076. By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of Ballinger & Perrot, of New York, favoring ratification of the League of Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3077. Also, petition of Wooden Box Manufacturers' Association, of New York, against class legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3078. Also, petition of Cap and Millinery Cutters' Union, Local No. 2, New York, favoring amnesty for political prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3079. Also, petition of Gray Silver, Charles A. Lyman, and T. C. Atkeson, favoring early passage of the Capper-Hersman

bill, permitting cooperative buying and selling; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3080. Also, petition of National Association of Box Manufacturers, of Chicago, favoring the repeal of the excess-profits tax law and the substitution of a flat tax on sales; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3081. Also, petition of operating and marine engineer service, protesting against report of the Joint Committee on Reclassification of Salaries; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

3082. By Mr. SANDERS of New York: Petition of the Botts-Fiorito Post, No. 576, the American Legion, of Le Roy, N. Y., urging the passage of legislation providing for the payment in cash of additional compensation to ex-service men based on the number of days' service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3083. By Mr. SINCLAIR: Petition of residents of Coopers-town and Bowman and vicinity, N. Dak., protesting against compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3084. Also, petition of the Central Labor Union of Williston, N. Dak., protesting against the deportation of citizens without proper process of law; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3085. Also, petition of the Association of American State Geologists, approving of plan for a survey of the power requirements of the Washington-Boston industrial area; to the Committee on Water Power.

3086. By Mr. TILSON: Petition of the New Haven Real Estate Board of New Haven, Conn., opposing House bill No. 12397; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, April 20, 1920.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we bring to Thee the high motives of this place and office with a resolve to do our best to uplift the world and to glorify Thy name. We open our hearts to the impression of Thy truth as we start upon the duties of a new day, and pray Thee to guide us in all our deliberations. May our conclusions have Thy favor resting upon them. For Christ's sake. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (George A. Sanderson) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1920.

To the SENATE:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALBERT B. CUMMINS,
President pro tempore.

M. SMOOT thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer for the day.

The Reading Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

S. 806. An act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Iowa Tribe of Indians against the United States; and

S. 2442. An act authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey to the trustees of the Yankton Agency Presbyterian Church, by patent in fee, certain land within the Yankton Indian Reservation.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution:

H. R. 5163. An act authorizing certain tribes of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 8690. An act for the relief of certain homestead entrymen;

H. R. 9228. An act to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Lake Superior, in Cook County, Minn.;

H. R. 10917. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States" by adding thereto an additional section;

H. R. 12956. An act extending the time for constructing a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew, in the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 13229. An act to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the women's bureau;

H. R. 13253. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Elmer Red River Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Red River;

H. R. 13274. An act to convey to the Big Rock Stone & Construction Co. a portion of the military reservation of Fort Logan H. Roots, in the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 13387. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin;

H. R. 13592. An act to authorize certain homestead settlers or entrymen who entered the military or naval service of the United States during the war with Germany to make final proof of their entries; and

H. J. Res. 301. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of War to grant revocable licenses for the removal of sand and gravel from the Fort Douglas Military Reservation for industrial purposes.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 12260) to amend section 600 of the act approved September 8, 1916, entitled "An act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes," and it was thereupon signed by the Presiding Officer.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 9228. An act to authorize the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the coast of Lake Superior, in Cook County, Minn.;

H. R. 12956. An act extending the time for constructing a bridge across the Bayou Bartholomew, in the State of Arkansas;

H. R. 13253. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Elmer Red River Bridge Co. to construct a bridge across the Red River; and

H. R. 13387. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the St. Louis River between the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin.

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 8690. An act for the relief of certain homestead entrymen; and

H. R. 13592. An act to authorize certain homestead settlers or entrymen who entered the military or naval service of the United States during the war with Germany to make final proof of their entries.

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

H. R. 13274. An act to convey to the Big Rock Stone & Construction Co. a portion of the military reservation of Fort Logan H. Roots, in the State of Arkansas; and

H. J. Res. 301. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of War to grant revocable licenses for the removal of sand and gravel from the Fort Douglas Military Reservation for industrial purposes.

H. R. 5163. An act authorizing certain tribes of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 13229. An act to establish in the Department of Labor a bureau to be known as the women's bureau was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION.

H. R. 10917. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the National Education Association of the United States by adding thereto an additional section" was read twice by its title.

Mr. KING. I did not hear the suggestion which the Secretary made to the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON] has asked that the bill go to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. KING. I think it should go to the Committee on the Judiciary. All such measures which provide for Federal charters go to the Committee on the Judiciary, and that matter is receiving consideration there now. I ask that no reference be made of the bill until the Senator from Iowa is here, as I would not want to make any motion in his absence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will lie on the table for the present.